

Thesis
Submitted to
the University of Edinburgh,
For the Degree of Ph.D. in Divinity,
by James L. Ainslie, B.D.

THE DOCTRINE OF ORDERS
IN THE REFORMED CHURCHES
IN THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES.



Contents.

- I. Introduction. p. ~~22~~ 34.
New Testament Times.
Sub-Apostolic Period.
The Middle Ages, and the Mediaeval Latin Church.
- II. Historical Survey. p. ~~44~~ 55.
The Reformation Movement.
The Ministerial Order coming under Revision.
Priesthood of all Believers.
Luther's Views.
Views of Reformed Churchmen on the Ministry.
The Scriptures to be the Guide with regard to the Ministry.
Calvin's great influence in the formation of the
Reformed Ministry.
Political Conditions.
The Position in England.
The Position in Scotland.
The Headship of Christ.
- III. Ordinary Duties of the Reformed Ministerial Order. p. 97.
A Familiar Type of Ministry in the Present Time.
Unfamiliar when first inaugurated.
Mediaeval Priests' Duties.
Reformed Ministers not sacrificing Priests.
Priestly Vestments objected to.
Non-Residence forbidden.
Pluralities forbidden.
Ministers not to follow other occupations.
Preaching the chief duty of the Ministry.
It had to be the Preaching of the Word of God.
Pronouncements on this.
Features showing the emphasis on Preaching.
Other duties of the Ministry.
- IV. The Powers of the Reformed Ministerial Order. p. 129.
Powers of Papal Priests.
1) Spiritual Powers of the Reformed Ministry.
Ministers only to administer the Sacraments.
"The Power of the Keys".
This Power exercised in the Preaching of the
Word.
Also exercised by Church Discipline.
Excommunication.
"The Power of the Keys" in Discipline shared with
Elders.
Private, or Auricular, Confession.

Contents (continued).

Confession and Absolution in Public Worship.

Other Spiritual Powers.

2) Administrative Powers.

In the Church Courts.

This shared with Laymen.

Great Powers by reason of the greatness of the Church.

V. The Equality of Ministers. p.173.

The Four Classes of Church Officials.

Presidents or Moderators not inconsistent with Equality.

Scottish Superintendents.

Knox and Episcopacy.

Dr. Story and the Doctrine of Equality.

VI. The Control of the Ministerial Order. p.216.

Reformed Churches careful of the Control of the Ministry.

Civil Control over the Ministry.

Control in the French Church.

English Reformed Views.

Scottish Control.

The Headship of Christ.

VII. Admission to the Reformed Ministerial Order. p.237.

Scarcity of suitable Men for the Ministry.

No Thrusting into the Ministry.

The "Call", the Public Authorising.

Admission must be to Vacancies.

The Practice in Switzerland.

Selecting or Nominating.

Examination or Trials.

Election.

VIII. The Solemn Setting Apart, or the Ordination. p.257.

Solemn Setting Apart.

Scottish Ordinations.

Accompaniments of Ordinations.

Imposition of Hands.

Agents of Ordination.

IX. The Results of Ordination: the Question of the "Indelible Character" and Grace. p.301.

Roman Catholic Views on "Indelibility" and Grace.

Contents (continued).

Reformed Church Views on the "Indelible Character."
Perhaps some lingering thoughts of "Indelibility"
still remaining in the Reformed Churches.
The Giving of Grace in Ordination.

X. Apostolic Succession. p.312.

Different Theories of "Successions".

"Series" Theory.

"Transmission" Theory.

"Passing-on of Doctrine" Theory.

The Reformed Churches reject the theoretical "Successions".

A kind of "Succession" or "Series" which Reformed
Ministers can be related to.

XI. Validity. p.343.

A Right or Valid Ministry in distinction from a Wrong
or Invalid Ministry.

Opposing Claims regarding Validity.

Validity includes Lawfulness and Efficaciousness.

The Reformed Ministry had its Lawfulness by reason
of the "Call".

That really was the authorisation by that Church
which is the True Church.

Efficaciousness is due to the Possession of the
Preaching of the Word.

XII. Summing Up and Conclusion. p.377.

List of Documents and Books
Consulted. p.1

Abbreviations. p.14.

Foreword. p.16.

**List of Documents and Books Read or Consulted in Connection with
the Preparation of the Thesis.**

I. Literature Contemporary with the Several Periods Concerned.

1) Early Church.

Epistles of Ignatius, Edited by J.H. Swrawley, London, 1919.

Apostolic Fathers, Edited by Kirsopp Lake, London, 1912.

Bishop Sarapion's Prayer Book. Edited by John Wordsworth.
London, 1899.

2) Mediaeval Church and Its Successor.

Aquinas- Summa Theologica. Literally Translated by the Fathers
of the English Dominican Province. London, 1922.

Canones et Decreta Concilii Tridentini. Typis S. Congregationis
de Propaganda Fide. Rome, 1845.

3) Lutheran and German Reformed.

Luther's Primary Works. Edited by Wace & Buchheim.
London, 1876.

Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des sechszehnten Jahrhunderts
in Deutschland. Leipzig, 1871.
Edited by A.E. Richter.

Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI Jahrhunderts.
Edited by J.E. Sehling. Leipzig,
Vol. I. 1902.
Vol. II. 1904.

Der Heidelberger Katechismus. Dritte Auflage. Erlangen, 1924.

4) Zürich Reformation.

Zwingli- Sämtliche Werke, Band IV. (Corpus Reformatorum)
Leipzig, 1927.

Zwingli- Sämtliche Werke. Edited by Usteri & Vögelin, 2 Vols.
Zürich,
Vol. I. 1819.
Vol. II. 1820

List of Documents & Books (Continued)

5) Genevan Reformation.

- Calvin- Institutes. Edited by M. Beveridge . Vol. III.
Calvin Translation Society. Edinburgh, 1846.
- Calvin- Letters.
Edited by J. Bonnet. 2 Vols Edinburgh.
Vol. I. 1855.
Vol. II. 1857.
- Calvin- Letters. French Edition, by J. Bonnet. Vol. II.
Paris, 1854.
- Calvin- Commentaries. Edited by J. Pringle.
Calvin Translation Society. Edinburgh, 1851.
- Calvin- Tracts. Vols. II, III.
Calvin Translation Society. Edinburgh,
Vol. II. 1849
Vol. III. 1851.
- Calvin- De Necessitate Reformandae Ecclesiae.
Calvin's Works, Edited by Baur and Others, Vol. VI.
- Geneva- Confession of 1537. Given in "L'Eglise de Genève",
by H. Meyer.
Geneva, 1909.
- Geneva- "Ordonnances" of 1541. Do.
- Geneva- "Ordonnances" of 1576. Do.
- La Liturgie de Neufchatel et Vallangin. Basle 1713.

6) French Reformation.

- Synodicon in Gallia Reformata. Edited by John Quick. 2 Vols.
London, 1692.
- Beza- Histoire des Eglise Reformées de France. 3 Vols.
Lille, 1841.
- Beza- A Confession of Faith &c. with "An Exhortation".
London, 1562.
- Discipline or Book of Order of the Reformed Church of France.
Edited by Marguerite G. Campbell. London, 1924.

List of Documents and Books (Continued).

7) Continental Reformation - Miscellaneous.

Creeds of the Evangelical Protestant Churches.

Edited by Philip Schaff. London, 1879.

Documents of the Continental Reformation.

Edited by B. J. Kidd. Oxford, 1911.

Codex Liturgicus. Edited by H. A. Daniel. 4 Vols.

Leipzig, 1847 to 1853.

Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis Publicatarum.

Edited by H.A.Niemeyer.

Leipzig, 1840.

Hales, John- "Golden Remains". Letters from the Synod

of Dort.

London, 1711.

8) English Reformation and After.

The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI.

Everyman's Library Edition. London. No date

Liturgiae Britannicae. Edited by W. Keeling.

London, 1851.

Whittingham, Wm.- "A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at

Frankfort, 1554-1558, A.D."

Edited by Edward Arber. London, 1908.

The Zurich Letters. Edited by H. Robinson.

Parker Society. First Series, 1558-1579.

Second Series. 1558-1602.

Cambridge, 1842 and 1845.

Works of John Whitgift. Parker Society. 3 Vols.

Cambridge, 1851.

Cartwright, Thos.- "Confutation of the Rhemists".

(No place of publication shewn) 1618.

Cartwright, T. & Travers, Walter.- "A Directory of Church
Government". 1574.

Given in "American Presbyterianism",

by C.A.Briggs.

New York, 1885.

List of Documents and Books (Continued.)

8) English Reformation and After, (continued)

Cooper, Thos.- "An Admonition to the People of England." 1589.
London, 1847.

Udall, John- "A Demonstration of the Truth of that Discipline &c." 1588.
Edited by Edward Arber. London, 1880.

Fenner, D.- "A Defence of the godlie Ministers &c." 1587.

Presbyterian Movement in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth.
Edited by R. C. Usher. London, 1905.

Puritan Manifestoes: A Study of the Origin of the Puritan
Revolt; with a Reprint of the Admonition to
the Parliament &c. Edited by W. H. Frere
and C. E. Douglas.
London, 1907.

"A Parte of a Register, contayninge sundrie Memorable Matters &c".
1605.

"The Seconde Parte of a Register &c." 1593. 2 Vols.
Edited by Albert Peel. Cambridge, 1915.

The Marprelate Tracts, Edited by Wm. Pierce.
London, 1911.

Hooker, Richard, Works of, Edited by J. Keble. Vol. III.
2nd. Edition. Oxford, 1841.

Hooker, R.- "Laws of Ecclesiastical" Polity." 2 Vols.
Everyman's Library. London, 1907.

Westminster Confession of Faith. Edinburgh, 1827

Westminster Catechisms. Do.

Westminster Directory for Public Worship. Do.

Westminster Form of Presbyterial Government. Do.

Westminster Directory. Edited by Thos. Leishman .
Edinburgh & London, 1901.

Minutes of the Westminster Assembly.
Edited by A. F. Mitchell & J. Struthers.
Edinburgh & London. 1874.

List of Documents and Books (Continued).

8) English Reformation and After. (continued).

Lightfoot, John- "Journal of the Proceedings of the
Westminster Assembly of Divines, 1643-1644."
Edited by J.R.Pitman.
being Vol. XVI of the Whole Works of John Lightfoot.
London, 1824.

Gillespie, George- "Notes of Debates and Proceedings of
the Assembly of Divines, 1644-1645."
Edited by D. Meek. Edinburgh, 1846.

Baxter, Richard- Autobiography. Edited by J.M.Loyd Thomas.
London & Toronto, 1925.

Baxter, Richard- "The Reformed Pastor".
Edited by W. Brown. London, 1862.

Provincial Assembly of London- "A Vindication of the
Presbyterial Government and Ministry". 1649.
London, 1650.

Provincial Assembly of London- "Jus Divinum Ministerii
Evangelici."
London, 1654.

9) Scottish Reformation and After.

A Collection of Confessions of Faith. Vol. II.
Edited by Dunlop. Edinburgh, 1722.

Knox, John, Works of, Edited by David Laing.
Wodrow Society. Edinburgh, 1846 and onwards.
Contains Knox's History, in which are
The Scottish Confession of 1560.
The First Book of Discipline of 1560.

The Second Book of Discipline- In Dunlop's Collection of
Confessions (as above).

The Book of Common Order, or Knox's Liturgy.
Edited by G.W.Sprott. Edinburgh & London, 1901.

Winzet, Ninian- "Certain Tractates &c." 2 Vols.
Edited by J.K.Hewison. Edinburgh & London, 1888.

Row, John- History of the Kirk of Scotland, 1558-1639.
Wodrow Society. Edinburgh, 1847.

List of Documents and Books (Continued).

9) Scottish Reformation and After (continued).

Scot, Wm.- An Apologetical Narration.
Wodrow Society. Edinburgh, 1846.

Forbes, John- Certaine Records.
Wodrow Society. Edinburgh, 1846.

Bannatyne, Richard- "Memoriales".
Edinburgh, 1836.

Spottiswoode, John- History of the Church of Scotland.
Edited by M. Russell.
Spottiswoode Society. Edinburgh, 1847.
Bannatyne Club. Do. , 1850.

Calderwood, David- History of the Kirk of Scotland.
Edited by T. Thomson. 8 Vols.
Wodrow Society. Edinburgh, 1843.

"Booke of the Universall Kirk of Scotland". Acts and
Proceedings of the Kirk of Scotland, from 1560.
3 Vols. Maitland Club Edition, Edinburgh, 1839.

Records of the Kirk of Scotland, from 1638. Vol. I.
Edited by Alexr. Peterkin. Edinburgh, 1838.

Melville, James- Autobiography & Diary, 1556-1610.
Edited by R. Pitcairn.
Wodrow Society. Edinburgh, 1842.

Miscellany of the Wodrow Society. Vol. I.
Edited by D. Laing. Edinburgh, 1844.

Johnston, of Wariston, Diary of, 1632-1639.
Edited by G.M. Paul.
Scottish History Society. Edinburgh, 1911.

Gillespie, George- "Aaron's Rod Blossoming". circa 1646.
Edinburgh, 1844.

Gillespie, George- "Assertions of the Government of the Church
of Scotland". (included in the Westr. Assembly "Notes"
Edinburgh, 1846.

Gillespie, George- "A Form for Church Government and Ordination
of Ministers, Contained in CXI Propositions.
London, 1647.

Scotland and the Protectorate. Edited by C.H. Firth.
Scottish Historical Society. Edinburgh, 1899.

List of Documents and Books (Continued).

9) Scottish Reformation and After (continued).

Register of the Consultations of the Ministers of
Edinburgh, Vol. I. 1652-1657.
Edited by W. Stephen.
Scottish History Society. Edinburgh, 1921.

Baillie, Robert- Letters and Journals, 1637-1662.
Edited by D. Laing, 3Vols. Edinburgh, 1841.

Form of Process. 1707.
Edinburgh, 1790.

II Books on Ministerial Order.

Hatch, Edwin- The Organization of the Early Christian Church.
London, 1882.

Lightfoot, J. B.- The Christian Ministry.
London,

Hort, F. J. A.- The Christian Ecclesia.
London, 1897.

Lindsay, T.M.- The Church and the Ministry in the Early
Centuries. London, 1902.

Harnack, Adolf- The Constitution and Law of the Church in
the First Two Centuries. London, 1910.

Bawlinson, A.E.J.- The Historical Origins of the Christian
Ministry. (In "Foundations", edited by
B.H. Streeter.)
London, 1912.

Gore, Charles- The Church and the Ministry.
London, 1919.

Gore, Charles- The Holy Spirit in the Church.
London, 1924.

Swete, H.B. (Editor)- Essays on the Early History of the
Church and Ministry. London, 1918.

Moberly, R.C.- Ministerial Priesthood.
London, 1899.

Mason, A.J.- The Church of England and Episcopacy.
Cambridge, 1914.

List of Books and Documents (Continued).

II. Books on Ministerial Order (continued).

Whitney, J.P.- The Episcopate and the Reformation.
London, 1917.

Mackenzie, Kenneth D.- The Case for Episcopacy.
London, 1929.

Lockton, W.- Divers Orders of Ministers.
London, 1930.

Wiseman, Cardinal- The Anglican Claim of Apostical
Succession. London, 1905 (1839).

Barnes, A.S.- The Popes and the Ordinal.
2nd. Editn. London, 1898.

Bishops of the (R.C.) Province of Westminster.- A Vindication
of the Bull "Apostolicae Curae".
London, 1898.

Story, R.H.- The Apostolic Ministry in the Scottish Church.
Edinburgh & London, 1897.

Vinet, Alexr.- Pastoral Theology.
Edinburgh, 1852.

III. Histories.

Fisher, G.P.-History of the Christian Church.
London, 1896.

D'Aubigné, J.H.Merle,- History of the Reformation.
Edinburgh, 1850.

Lindsay, T.M.- History of the Reformation. 2 Vols.
Edinburgh

Cambridge Modern History. Vol. II. The Reformation.
Cambridge, 1903.

Schaff, Philip- The Swiss Reformation. 2 Vols.
Edinburgh, 1893.

Ruchat, Abraham- Histoire de la Réformation de la Suisse.
Nyon, 1835.

Meyer, Henri- L'Église de Genève.
(Containing the Confession of 1537,
"Ordonnances" of 1541,
Do. of 1576.)
Geneva, 1909.

List of Books and Documents(Continued).

III. Histories (continued).

Borgeaud, Charles- Histoire de l'Université de Genève.
1559-1798.

Geneva, 1900.

Martin, Charles- Les Protestant Anglais réfugiés à Genève.
Geneva, 1915.

Rohler, W.- Das Buch der Reformation Huldrych ZWinglis.
Munich, 1926.

Staehlin, D.E.- Das Buch der Basler Reformation.
Basel, 1929.

Duruy, V.- A Short History of France, 2 Vols.
Emeryman's Library. London, 1918.

Vienot, J.- Histoire de la Réforme Francaise.
Paris, 1926.

Hanotaux, Gabriel- La France en 1614.
Paris, 1913.

Grant, A.J.- The Huguenots.
London, 1934.

Cowell, M.J. The French Walloon Church at Glastonbury.
London, 1928.

Trevelyan, G.M.- History of England.
London, 1933.

Procter, F. & Frere, W.H.- A New History of the Book of
Common Prayer. London, 1901.

Pullan, Leighton- History of the Book of Common Prayer.
London, 1905.

Drysdale, A.H.- History of the Presbyterians in England.
London, 1887.

Campbell, M.G.- Early English Presbyterianism and the
Reformed Church of France.
Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society,
May 1922.

Campbell, M.G.- Early Presbyterianism in the Channel Islands.
Journal of the Presbyterian Historical Society.
May 1923.

List of Books and Documents (Continued).

III. Histories (continued).

- Pierce, Wm.- An Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts. London, 1908.
- Hetherington, W.M.- History of the Westminster Assembly. Edinburgh, 1843.
- Warrack, J.- Domestic Life in Scotland, 1488-1688. London, 1920.
- Wodrow, Robt.- History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland. Vol. IV. Glasgow, 1831.
- Grub, George- An Ecclesiastical History of Scotland. Vols. II, III. Edinburgh, 1861.
- Cunningham, J.- The Church History of Scotland. 2 vols. 2nd. Editn. Edinburgh, 1882.
- Mitchell, A.F.- The Scottish Reformation. Edinburgh, 1900.
- Warr, C.L.- The Presbyterian Tradition. London, 1933.
- Godkin, E.L.- History of the Protestant Church in Hungary. London, 1854.
- Revesz & Kovats & Ravasz- Hungarian Protestantism. Budapest, 1927.
- Wordsworth, J.- The National Church of Sweden. London, 1911.
- Lehtonen, Aleksi- The Church of Finland. Helsingfors, 1927.

IV% Biographies.

- Workman, H.B.- John Wyclif. 2 Vols. Oxford, 1926.
- Kostlin, J.- Life of Luther. 2nd. Editn. London, 1898.
- Boehmer, H.- Luther and the Reformation. London, 1930.
- Richard, J.W.- Philip Melancthon. London, 1898.

List of Books and Documents (Continued).

IV. Biographies (continued).

- Jackson, S.M.- Huldreich Zwingli.
New York & London, 1901.
- Zimmermann, G.R.- Die Zürcher Kirche. (A series of
short biographies.) Zurich, 1878.
- Walker, J.- John Calvin.
New York & London, 1906.
- Rayburn, H.V.- John Calvin: His Life Letters and Work.
London, 1914.
- Baird, H.M.- Theodore Beza.
New York & London, 1899.
- Whitehead, A.W.- Gaspard de Coligny.
London, 1904.
- Pearson, A.E.Scott- Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan
Puritanism. Cambridge, 1925.
- Brown, P. Hume- John Knox, a Biography.
London, 1895.
- Lorimer, P.- John Knox and the Church of England.
London, 1875.
- Wodrow, R.- Collections for the Life of the Rev. Robt. Bruce.
Together with his Sermons. Edited by W. Cunningham.
Wodrow Society. Edinburgh, 1843.
- Wodrow, R.- Collections upon the Lives of the Reformers
and Most Eminent Ministers of the Church of Scotland.
Vol. I. Maitland Club. Glasgow, 1834.
- Knox, E.A.- Robert Leighton, Archbishop of Glasgow.
London, 1930.

V. Miscellaneous.

- Coulton, G.G.- Life in the Middle Ages.
Cambridge, 1928-1830.
- Cutts, E.L.- Parish Priests and their People in the
Middle Ages in England. London, 1914.
- Dowden, J.- The Mediaeval Church in Scotland.
Glasgow, 1910.
- Möhler, J.A.- Symbolik.
Mainz, 1843.

List of Documents and Books (Continued).

V. Miscellaneous.

- Erasmus, D.- Twenty Select Colloquies.
London.
- Wicksteed, P.H.- The Ecclesiastical Institutions of
Holland. London, 1875.
- Hunter, A.M.- The Teaching of Calvin.
Glasgow, 1920.
- Gasquet & Bishop- Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer.
London, 1928.
- Neil & Willoughby- The Tutorial Prayer Book.
London, 1913.
- Mastie, W.- The Theology of the Reformed Church.
Edinburgh, 1904.
- Macgregor, Janet G.- The Scottish Presbyterian Polity.
Edinburgh & London, 1926.
- M'Crie, C.G.- The Public Worship of Presbyterian Scotland.
Edinburgh, 1892.
- McMillan, Wm.- The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church.
London, 1931.
- Sprott, G.W.- Worship and Offices of the Church of
Scotland. Edinburgh, 1882.
- Leishman, T.- The Ritual of the Church of Scotland.
In "The Church of Scotland, Past and Present",
Edited by R.H. Story. Vol. V. London.
- Walker, James- The Theology and the Theologians of
Scotland. Edinburgh, 1888.
- The Conversations at Malines, 1921-1925.
Oxford, 1928.
- The Conversations at Malines, 1921-1925. Original Documents.
Edited by Lord Halifax. London, 1930.
- Inge, W.R.- Protestantism.
London, 1931.
- Ramsay, W.M.- The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D.170.
London, 1900.
- Hoffmann, H.E. von - Das Kirchenverfassungsrecht der nieder-
ländischen Reformierten bis 1618/19. Leipzig, 1902

List of Documents and Books (Continued).

VI. Relevant Sections in the following:-

Encyclopaedia Britannica.

Chambers' Encyclopaedia.

Harmsworth Encyclopaedia.

Catholic Encyclopaedia.

Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.

Lutheran Cyclopaedia.

The (American Episcopal) Church Cyclopaedia.

The Protestant Dictionary.

Hastings Dictionary of the Bible.

Hastings Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.

Hastings Dictionary of the Apostolic Church.

Dictionary of National Biography.

Abbreviations used in Referring to

Documents and Books.

Aquinas = Aquinas- "Summa Theologica"

Briggs = Briggs- "American Presbyterianism" which in an Appendix contains "A Directory of Church Government". 1574.

Calvin- Inst. = Calvin- "Institutes".

- Tracts = Do. "Tracts."

- Com. = Do. Commentaries.

- Letters = Do. Letters, Edited by Bonnet.

Campbell = Campbell, Mrs.M.G.- Discipline and Book of Order of the Reformed Churches of France.

C. of Trent = Council of Trent.

Daniel = Daniel- "Codex Liturgicus."

Dunlop = Dunlop- "A Collection of Confessions of Faith &c."

Meyer = Meyer- "L'Église de Genève" which contains the documents of that Church.

"Jus Divinum M. E." = "Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici" of 1654.

Kidd = Kidd- "Documents of the Continental Reformation."

Laing's Knox = Laing- "Works of John Knox."

Lightfoot = Lightfoot- "Journal of the Proceedings of the Westminster Assembly."

Mitchell and Struthers = Mitchell and Struthers- Minutes of the Westminster Assembly.

Niemeyer = Niemeyer- "Collectio Confessionum."

"Parte Register" = "A Parte of a Register", 1605.

Peterkin = Peterkin- "Records of the Kirk of Scotland."

"Puritan Manifestoes" = Frere and Douglas- "Puritan Manifestoes."

Richter = Richter- "Die Evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des sechszehnten Jahrhunderts in Deutschland".

Abbreviations (continued).

- Schaff = Schaff- "Creeds of the Evangelical Protestant Churches."
- "Seconde Parte Register" = "The Seconde Parte of a Register", Editd. A. Peel.
- Sehling = Sehling- "Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI Jahrhunderts."
- Synodicon = Quick- "Synodicon in Gallia Reformata."
- Univ. Kirk = "Booke of the Universall Kirk of Scotland". Acts and Proceedings from 1560.
- Usteri & V. = Usteri and Vögelin-- Zwingli, Sämtliche Werke.
- Wace and Buchheim = Wace and Buchheim- "Luther's Primary Works".
- Westr. Conf. = Westminster Confession of Faith.
Do. Cat. = Do. Catechism.
Do. Dir. = Do. Directory of Public Worship.
Do. Gov. = Do. Form of Church Government.
- Whitgift = Whitgift, Works of, - Containing much of Cartwright's writings.
- Zwingli Corp. = Zwingli- Sämtliche Werke (Corpus Reformatorum).

Note.

In quotations, the words placed between brackets are not in the original text.

FOREWORD .

All the Churches which broke off from the Papal Church at the time of the great Reformation Movement of the Sixteenth Century may be called Reformed Churches. Even the Papal Church itself, compelled by the pressure of the public opinion of the times to make some effort to put its house in order, may be looked on as re-forming ~~re-forming~~ itself to some extent either for better or for worse.

But at that time there was a certain church movement which arose in Switzerland, and largely received its guidance and ideals and inspiration from the great Reformers of that country, especially from Calvin. It organized itself into Churches in a number of lands. This in particular has been called the Reformed Church Movement, and the Churches belonging to it have been commonly known as the Reformed Churches, as they are on the Continent up to the present day. We may conveniently use the description given by Dr. Mastie in his "Theology of the Reformed Churches"- "By the Reformed Churches is meant that widely distributed branch of protestantism, distinct from the Lutheran Church, which originated in the Reformation that was inaugurated, independently of Luther's work, in Switzerland by Zwingli and carried on by Calvin and other Reformers there; which took shape in France, in certain parts of Germany, in Hungary, in Holland, and in England; and which is of supreme importance to ourselves, as including, through the Reformation of John Knox, our own Scottish Reformed Church, and its great and ever growing offshoots in America, in our own colonies and elsewhere."(pp.1.2.)

Foreword.

It is the purpose of the following Thesis to examine the Doctrine of Orders in these Reformed Churches. Stating the subject more fully, the purpose is to study and examine the recognized or prevalent or accepted beliefs and established practices (for in all such the doctrine is seen) in these Churches with regard to Ministerial Orders. This last phrase, we may say, is what is commonly used to denote the office of the Ministry in the Christian Church. The plural "Orders" might suggest that there are many Orders. Yet there can be only one Order, the one official Ministry in the Christian Church, and, as it has sometimes been pointed out, it is more correct to speak of "Order" than "Orders", even though there be, as in the Roman and Anglican Churches, different ranks and classes of ministry. There is, however, one advantage in the use of the plural word, in that it at once conveys this right impression, that the conception of the Ministerial Order should contain the idea of living forces of men, who need not have one uniform function, but are there to engage in such varied activities as may best serve the ends of the Ministry.

There may be some who will say that, it will not take long to write on this subject with reference to the Reformed Churches; that there are practically no Orders in these Churches; they were all swept away at the Reformation. There is surely some mistake here. It is quite true that a Ministerial Order of the Roman or Anglican type was swept away at the Reformation. But that is not to say that these Churches were left without a Ministerial Order. It was, and is, quite possible to conceive of

Foreword.

an Order different from what is found in either the Roman or Anglican Churches. Such an Order the Reformed Church leaders, theologians and ecclesiastics, did think of, and what is more, they were instrumental in bringing it into being.

This different Order - how it was conceived, and what was believed about it, - cannot but be an interesting study even to those who are not in favour of it, and much more so to those who accept it, and consider it to be, at the least, among the best of the forms which the Ministerial Order can take in the Christian Church.

In treating of the matter I have thought it best that the authorities and witnesses should largely speak for themselves, and so I have made numerous and long quotations. In so doing I have tried to give the language and spelling of my authorities.

Perhaps I ought to explain my use of certain designations. I usually speak of the Roman Catholic Church of the period before, and in the transition years after, the Reformation, as the Mediaeval or Papal Church. It seems better, if possible, to have some distinguishing name for it. The Church of the Middle Ages was not precisely the same as the present day Catholic or Roman Catholic Communion. At the Reformation it came to lose certain elements which had been in it previously; an evangelic element, by a large withdrawing of the evangelically-minded from it; mental and intellectual elements, when the Northern Nations to a great extent ~~withdrew from~~ fell away from it and ceased to give to it their racial methods and habits of thought. Moreover, beliefs

Foreword.

and principles were established by the Council of Trent which had not previously been dogmatically defined. The Church also received new elements through the rise and progress of the powerfully influential Jesuit Order. Then to come to modern times, there have been the important promulgations of the doctrines of the Immaculate Conception and the Infallibility of the Pope. All these circumstances were sufficient to bring about some change in the character of the Church of the Roman obedience.

The kind of Order which contains bishops of the Roman and Anglican type I have frequently spoken of, though conscious that it is not quite satisfactory, as "prelatic episcopacy"; and to distinguish the Roman from the Anglican when necessary I have used the phrases "Papal episcopacy", and "English hierarchy", or the like. I could hope that this will not seem in the least a derogatory way of describing the Orders of these Churches. It is not meant to be so. It is only adopted in order to be more exact in distinguishing the kind of episcopacy referred to. There are more kinds than Roman and Anglican. There is the episcopacy of the Methodist Episcopal Church of America, that of the Hungarian Reformed Church, that of some Lutheran Churches. And one must not forget that to the Reformers the name "bishop" was held to be synonymous with that of "pastor" or "minister" when rightly used. So ^{for} want of better distinctive names and phrases I have used the ones mentioned above.

Those who were adherents and advocates of Reformed Church principles in England I have usually called Reformed Churchmen

Foreword.

and not Puritans. They did not like the name of Puritan to be applied to themselves although we now think of it as an honourable name. In any case it is not sufficiently distinctive of the favourers of the Reformed or Presbyterian church polity and doctrine, for Independents and Baptists have also been called Puritans. The designation "Reformed Churchmen" seems more precise.

The period over which our study extends is that of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. It was in the course of these two Centuries that the Reformed Church Order arose and became definitely constituted. It was not that it took two centuries to evolve and develop. It came forth in the Reformation times at the beginning with considerable clearness and distinctness. But these two Centuries gave the time for it to settle and take up its position, to define itself and realize itself through the toils and stresses of varying political and religious movements, and against much opposition and persecution.

The subject is no doubt bristling with questions on which there has been and still is, much controversy. It is impossible for anyone to make an absolutely neutral survey of it. The present writer confesses he could not. He writes as a Reformed Churchman. Yet he hopes he has managed to write as one not unduly biassed in favour of any view, nor so prejudiced as to be unable to state accurately what he has found in the course of his investigation. And the fact of the subject being controversial has made it seem all the more worth while making researches into it in the hope of more fully bringing out the truth regarding it.

34.

The Doctrine of Orders
in the Reformed Churches in
the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.

I. Introduction.

In beginning an examination of the Ministerial Order in the Reformed Churches it will be advantageous to take a brief survey of the course and character of the Christian Ministry from the beginnings of the Christian Church onwards to the time when the Order of the Reformed Churches came to be instituted. It is especially needful to say something about New Testament church officials, for the Reformed leaders on principle examined minutely all that there was to be found by them concerning the ministry and church organization in the New Testament. They believed that not only was there guidance for them there, and suggestions, as to what might be a worthy Order of the Ministry, but that there the true Ministry was authoritatively shown forth and authorised.

It will also be advantageous to notice very briefly what changes were brought about in the Christian Ministry during the succeeding centuries to the close of the Middle Ages, in order that we may understand the kind of Ministry which in course of time developed, and from which the Reformers departed when they were bringing in that Ministerial Order which we are setting ourselves to examine. A detailed discussion would be out of place, but we must touch upon points which bear upon our present subject.

I. Introduction.

There are different opinions as to when the Christian Church began. Some consider it to have been on the Day of Pentecost when there was the abundant outpouring of the Holy Spirit (Acts II). But surely we must agree it had a beginning earlier than that. When Christ is amongst even two or three believing disciples, there is the Church. As soon as Christ had called the first few disciples to follow Him, and they had obeyed, then the Church began. With that company of the Twelve definitely attached to Him, He had clearly a nucleus of the Church. The Church at that time, of course, had no office-bearers nor leaders but One, ^{that was} ~~even~~ Christ Himself. And even when the number of believers on Him had increased, so that He had disciples in all parts of the land, the Twelve were not appointed by Him to be officials among them. They were as yet but students in His school. He sent them out to teach and to preach for Him. But that was not an appointment there and then to an office. He quite as readily sent out other seventy also to do similar work.

On the Day of Pentecost referred to above, although, as we consider, the beginning of the Church did not then take place, yet by the special bestowal of the Holy Spirit on the Christian community, there came a powerful confirming and establishing of the Church, and there was concurrently a large increase in the number of its adherents. It is important to notice in this connection that the Holy Spirit was outpoured, not on one section or class alone, but upon the whole membership of the

I. Introduction.

Church. From this it may be concluded that if there were to be any passing on, or transmission, of the Spirit to succeeding generations of the Church, the whole Church was thus placed in the position to effect this transmission.

If there were any real foundation for certain much-asserted later theories, one would expect here in the record some mention of the Twelve coming forward as the directors of the new religious society, and showing that they had been ordained thereto by the laying on of the hands of Jesus to be His first ruling bishops. There is, however, nothing at all like this. The Twelve, with their number now made up again by the election of Matthias, are quite left in the background, except Peter and John. Peter comes forward prominently as a speaker and leader in the growing Church. He seems to have been naturally inclined to speak and take a lead. And John also has ~~some~~ considerable prominence in the early chapters of the Acts. But neither here nor in the Gospels have we mention of the Twelve having been ordained with "the laying on of hands", or with any other ceremonial. Roman Catholics, in order to find an ordination ceremonial for the Apostles, say that it took place at the Last Supper when Jesus presented to them the paten and chalice, and thus made them priests. That, to say the least of it, seems a rather forced interpretation of the Gospel account, and one cannot think any will accept it except those who are specially predisposed that way. If we were to accept it, must we not suppose that every time the Lord's Supper is repeated an ordination takes place ?

I. Introduction.

Some may believe that the priesthood was conferred on the Apostles in the Upper Room when Jesus breathed on those present and said- "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whose soever sins ye remit &c." If it was so, we must conclude it was conferred on all present, on ten Apostles (Thomas was absent) and all others of the company, which on that occasion seems to have been made up of most of the men and women who were the intimate friends and followers of Jesus.

From such evidence as we have, it is more reasonable to conclude that the Apostles were not placed in the Ministry of Christ by any special ceremonial and formula, but by being called by Christ to follow Him, by being trained to be His witnesses, and by being commissioned by Him to preach His Gospel.

Again, if we were inclined to accept some of the greatly valued theories of the Ministerial Office, and fully realized what is required by them, we would be led in all probability to conclude that, at or soon after the bestowal of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, the Apostles must have formed themselves into a kind of Collegium to take charge of the Church, to appoint additional church officials, and to see that all future and further officials would be appointed by themselves during their lifetime with the due ceremonial and accompanying right formulae, and to make regulations that their successors must do the same for all time coming. The Twelve did not do anything of the kind so far as the records inform us.⁽¹⁾ If they had done so, it would have been something very different from

(1) Cf. Streeter- "The Primitive Church". p.38.

I. Introduction.

the known instructions of Christ to them. From Him they had received the great Commission- "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel"; "Go ye therefore and teach all nations." And these clear words of instruction fit in with the words of promise to them from Jesus shortly before His Ascension- "Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses unto Me". It was just this ministry of witnessing, then enjoined on the Apostles, which Peter immediately took up on that very day of Pentecost. In speaking to the people he said- "This Jesus did God raise up whereof we are witnesses." He shows the same recognition of what his peculiar ^{mission} was when later on, speaking to the people in the Temple (Acts III.15.) he said- "Ye -- killed the Prince of Life; Whom God raised from the dead; whereof we are witnesses". And again, when before the Sanhedrin (Acts V.32.), he said- "And we are witnesses of these things; and so is the Holy Ghost". And again, when addressing Cornelius and his household, Peter uses the same words (Acts X.39.)- "And we are witnesses of all things which He did both in the ^{country} ~~company~~ of the Jews and in Jerusalem." For witnessing to the earthly life of Christ, and to what was the spiritual and religious value of that earthly life, the Twelve had had a unique preparation. And so no others could fulfil exactly the same kind of ministry. This was to be their ministry in and for the Church, a unique witnessing. It was a ministry which it was impossible for them to pass on to others. Laying stress on this, the unique acquaintance with

I. Introduction.

Christ in the flesh, and the testimony which in consequence they could give, we can see, that the Reformed teachers were right, however they may have arrived at their opinion, when they said that the special office of ministry which the Apostles exercised was not perpetual in the Church. It was impossible for any others to witness to Christ on the same grounds as these companions of Jesus could witness. We would emphasise this fact although we would be the last to say that an apostolic ministry is impossible for others. It has been the gift of God to the Church in all ages. Only this we say, that a ministerial office, gaining a special value by reason of those holding it having had closest and most intimate acquaintance with Jesus Christ in the days of His flesh, belonged only to that small band of men who accompanied Him during His earthly ministry. It was incommunicable in its peculiar function, and inevitably wanting to all others entering later the Ministry of Christ's Church.

After Pentecost we may suppose, although the record does not say so, that the Twelve would remain for a while in and around Jerusalem. There is a tradition that they continued there for about twelve years. On the truth of this one cannot definitely pronounce. Of James, the brother of John, we do know that he was put to death by Herod Agrippa I in A.D. 44. Concerning Peter and John we have some items of authentic information. Of the rest we know practically nothing. Only some uncertain and contradictory traditions remain. Of some of them

I. Introduction.

we hardly expect to hear much, for even in the Gospels they are no more than names in a list. Perhaps in course of time they went singly or in twos evangelizing in different countries. We can well believe that their unique ability to witness to Christ would not be lost. In all probability Christian communities sprang up as a result of their preaching the Gospel. This, however, may be said here. If it is to these Apostles it is proposed to trace back an Apostolic Succession, the theorists will have great difficulty in finding certainties. If the great spiritual fabric of the Church requires in some formal manner to be based on them, then their obscurity is a calamity.

In Jerusalem in the early days of the Christian community certain officials were appointed. It will not be misrepresenting them to describe them as a committee or board for dispensing the Poor Fund of the Jerusalem Church. They were seven in number. Commonly they have been called the Seven Deacons, but the Book of Acts does not do so. They were appointed to "deacon" (*διακονεῖν*) or "serve" "tables", but that does not give us ~~their~~ their name, for the Apostles also in the same place speak of themselves as undertaking the "diaconship" of the Word. They seem, from what we are told of one or two of them, to have been good evangelists and preachers, as well as having the duty in the first place of "serving tables". To us there is nothing strange in that. Our artisan foreign missionaries, for example, in addition to teaching the converts to build and do joinery work, go about preaching as they may have

I. Introduction.

time and opportunity. The Seven were installed in their new office with laying on of hands by the Apostles. It may be that henceforward a body of this kind belonged permanently to the organization of the church in Jerusalem. We know that that church had some kind of organization. There were elders there, who, as we learn from Acts XV, acted along with Apostles in the administration of the affairs of the church. It is quite possible that whenever any of the Twelve were resident in Jerusalem, they were counted as elders in the Christian community there. ⁽¹⁾ Peter, we know, calls himself an elder in his letter to Christians of the Jewish Dispersion, and in the same place, as we may notice, does not fail to speak of himself as a special witness for Christ. Whether counted as elders or not in any church, it can hardly be doubted that wherever any of the original Twelve went, they would, because of their former personal fellowship with Christ on earth, carry with them authority and influence which could not have been stronger even if they had been given an official position conveyed to them in a formal manner.

Yet indeed in the Church of Jerusalem, Peter does not appear to have had a superior official position, however great an influence he may have exercised for other reasons. He was not a chief ruler or pope there. There was another man in that church who stood out apparently in a position of equal or greater authority. This was James, generally agreed to have been not one of the Twelve, but the Lord's brother. He is often spoken of as the bishop or president of the church in ⁽¹⁾ It is assumed that Peter was the writer of I Peter.

I. Introduction.

Jerusalem. To call him "bishop" is apt to be misleading, for it suggests to our ears prelacy and dioceses, and the position of James was not of that kind. He is perhaps more suitably described as the president, or leading elder, of the church. How he came to have that position in the church, whether it was one to which he had been formally called and elected and appointed, or whether the fact of his being the Lord's brother led to his being naturally treated with deference, we cannot say. Various assertions, of doubtful value, were made on the subject in later years. There was even made the improbable claim that James was appointed by Christ Himself. But the matter is obscure, and not ~~only~~^{alone} is it so, for from the extant evidence we can only obtain a vague and indistinct impression of the nature of the organization and officials of the church at Jerusalem. Consequently we may not take it and make of it an authoritative example for the organization of the Christian Church, still less find in it the revelation of the only right kind of Christian Ministry. Yet it does give us some indications of the constitution of one church in New Testament times. And these indications are of special interest to us because both the Reformed leaders and the Anglicans used them confidently in support of their own particular views on Church and Ministry.

Before we hear of James holding a leading position in the church in Jerusalem, the greatest and most numerous activities in promoting the progress of the Christian Church had already been entered upon ^{by} those other than the original Twelve, working

I. Introduction.

in and from other places apart from Jerusalem. In consequence of the persecution which arose when Stephen was martyred it is related- "They that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the Word." Christian adherents were filled with the missionary spirit. Even when they travelled in the way of trade and other intercourse, they carried the word of Jesus with them. It is just possible, too, that some Christian believers were to be found here and there who had seen and heard Jesus Himself during His active ministry in Galilee. Galilee was a region through^{which} there passed considerable numbers of traders from all parts. Some of these may have been moved to have faith in Christ, and having gone their several ways, carried with them their unforgettable religious experience. Through them small Christian communities may have begun in some places, or at least through their influence there had been a preparation of ground in which a Christian community could later grow up. Thus variously promoted, there would arise in not a few places, Christian communities whose founding was not directly due to the work of the original Apostles. The beginnings of the churches at Syrian Antioch and Rome appear to be examples of an unplanned and spontaneous spread of Christianity.

In the story of the progress of Christianity and the extension of the Christian Church in the early years, there stands out one great figure, that of the Apostle Paul. He was truly an Apostle though not one of the original Twelve, and apparently at times somewhat grudgingly recognized by those of

I. Introduction.

the Jerusalem Church. Along with him we can also name Barnabas and Silas, both apostolic men. Their efforts, especially those of Paul, for the spread of the Christian faith were immense, and were crowned with much success. Through the work of the Apostle Paul and his assistants, for the carrying out of which they made a number of prolonged missionary tours, numerous Christian communities were formed in Asia Minor and South Eastern Europe.

Thus it was brought about that during the First Century many churches came into being widely scattered in Western Asia, Southern Europe, and Northern Africa, and even in remoter parts. Now every Christian community was bound to feel its need sooner or later of organization of some kind. It could not continue without leaders and administrators and officials for various purposes. At first all might be very informal. In some cases where a man had lent his house for the meetings of the Christians, he might be looked on as their leader. In other cases where a prominent person in a town had become a Christian, because of his public position, he might quite naturally be looked up to as the guardian and leader of the Christian community. Sooner or later more formal organization would be required with duly appointed officials.

So far as the churches which were founded by the Apostle Paul are concerned, we know that he was careful to see that they should have some form of organization, and have men appointed to bear office in them. The names of the leading officials

I. Introduction.

are familiar to us from the references in the New Testament. They were called "elders" or "bishops", or according to the Greek, "presbuteroi" or "episkopoi". Modern scholars are generally agreed that these two names were used in the New Testament writings as designations of the same officials. It may be remarked here in passing that this was one point for which Reformed Churchmen frequently and strongly contended. We have nothing to show us how many "presbuteroi" were appointed in any of the churches founded by the Apostle Paul. Probably the number would vary according to the size of the particular community, or according to the number of suitable men available. And one does not know whether, after they were appointed as officials in the church, they continued to follow their ordinary occupations in business and trades. It is almost certain that they did so in the early years of the communities. They had the example of the Apostle himself who, at one time at any rate, worked at his trade in the midst of his missionary labours. But as time went on, particularly where there was growth in the number of believers, the duties of the officials would increase and whole-time service would be required of at least one of them. This might possibly be one among the causes which led to one "presbuteros" becoming the chief "presbuteros" or "episkopos" in the congregation.

In what form other Christian communities not founded by the Apostle Paul were organized at first, it is not possible to say with certainty. In fact, speaking in general, we cannot assert positively in what manner precisely the many scattered

I. Introduction.

communities organized themselves and developed during the Apostolic and Sub-Apostolic Period. This is in measure true even of the churches founded by the Apostle Paul, and still more so of others. The reason of our uncertainty is partly due to the fact that, in our two ~~sources~~ sources of information about the Early Church, the New Testament and the "Apostolic Fathers", the references to church organization and officials are scanty and inexplicit. They are of such a kind that they lend themselves to varied interpretations and to conjectural and imaginative "reading between the lines" according to the prepossessions of the readers. Moreover the uncertainty is also due to this, that the value of the references, even as they stand, depends on disputable ^{both} dates, for the New Testament writings and for the works of the "Apostolic Fathers".

It ~~has~~ has been thought that there was much variety in the organization of the early Christian communities. Canon Streeter ~~says~~ ⁽¹⁾ says they "varied enormously from place to place". As the documentary information in the matter is so scanty and uncertain, it will perhaps be allowable to put forward some "a priori" considerations which may possibly guide us.

1) We need have little doubt that there was variety in the many scattered churches. Seeing that there was no "jus divinum" for any particular form of church order and government, the churches had no compulsory directions to be observed in organizing. In this connection we may again refer to Canon Streeter who says- "In the Primitive Church there was no single system

(1) Streeter- "The Primitive Church". pp.46-47.

I. Introduction.

of Church Order laid down by the Apostles".(1). Thus we may postulate variety in the churches apart from such historical evidence as there may be for it. It would be the natural state of affairs.

2) Variety, however, in human organization is not unlimited. There are practically only a few main types. Of these only some could be adapted to a community of the nature of a Christian church.

3) The churches had models of organization before them both in the civil constitutions under which they lived, and in the Jewish synagogues, which were to be found in many of the cities and towns. There may be much truth in the contention of Hatch, that the organization of the Christian churches largely followed the lines of the civil and secular organizations. Still stronger, we can believe, was the influence of the Jewish synagogue, especially in places where numbers of Jews had joined the Christian church. The church in Jerusalem could hardly fail to be modelled upon the form of the numerous Jewish synagogues in the city, and the influence of its organization would spread far and wide.

4) There was continual intercourse between the scattered churches, with exchange of views and experiences, and that, in a formative period, would tend to promote similar types of organization. Neighbouring churches would particularly influence each other.

(1) Streeter- "The Primitive Church". p.261.

Cf. Headlam- "The Church of England". pp.12.13.

also Cf. Swatkin in Hastings's Dictionary of the Bible,
Article-"Bishop and Elder".

I. Introduction.

5) There seems no reason to suppose that the type of organization set up by the Apostle Paul in the churches of his foundation, of which we have at least some knowledge, was original with him and peculiar to him. What we know of other churches shows them also to have had officials named "presbyteroi" or "episkopoi".

6) Moreover, with regard to development in the organization of the churches, scholars are generally agreed that during the Apostolic and Sub-Apostolic Period, with greater or less rapidity according to varying circumstances, the churches were moving on into something like uniformity. This may be an indication that they could not have been radically different to begin with. Radically different organizations at the beginning would more naturally have led to radically different developments.

It is very generally agreed by scholars that by the end of the Sub-Apostolic Period, there had been adopted in most of the churches, if not all, a form of church organization which had one man as its leading official. Some scholars speak of this form of church organization as non-episcopacy or monarchical episcopacy, apparently using the terms interchangeably. For example it has been stated that what Ignatius⁽¹⁾ advocated so strongly was monarchical episcopacy. One would like to know precisely what is meant by such nomenclature.

It is misleading to many, for it suggests a prelacy where one

(1) Streeter- "The Primitive Church". pp.163,173,175.

I. Introduction.

man has monarchic control of a number of clergy in a diocese. But a form of church order of that kind had not yet come into being. The late Bishop Gore remarks- "Thus the bishop according to the early ideal was by no means the great prelate, he was the pastor of a flock, like the vicar of a modern town, in intimate relation with all his people."(1). We have no sufficient reason to suppose that the kind of "bishop" which Ignatius upheld so strongly was "the great prelate". Instead of using the terms "mon-episcopacy" and "monarchical episcopacy", we would probably more truly convey the right conception of the church organisation which had now come into existence by some such term as "sole-pastor-ministry", and by explaining that churches were organized with a president or minister-bishop at the head.

In conclusion, with regard to the Primitive Church, in spite of all our uncertainties, one can be fairly sure of this, that the arrangements were simple and the organization was unelaborate and having the character of an orderly Christian fellowship. The normal officials taking the lead were "presbuteroi-episkopoi", and later there was one special "presbuteros-episkopos" acting as president of the congregation or community (which might be made up of more than one congregation in a large city where the number of Christians had greatly increased). It may be said with a fair amount of confidence that the ideals for church and ministry adopted by the Reformed Church leaders were much more in accord with the New Testament

(1) Gore- "Church and Ministry". p.88.

Gf. Srawley- "Epistles of Ignatius". p.18.

I. Introduction.

and Primitive Church than any form of hierarchy has been or can be, (1).

In all human institutions there is a tendency ^{for them} to become more elaborate and complicated. Developments are usually from simpler forms to more complex, from less officialism to more officialism. This was the way in the Christian Church during its process of incessant change. When we come, after the end of the Second Century, to have ampler witnesses to the state of the Church, we find noticeable differences in the position of officials, and change still going on. In the course of a few centuries the simpler organization of the early period gave place to one which was more elaborate. Minister-bishops of single congregations or of town communities would come to have to do with the organizing and superintending of communities in the smaller towns and villages of the surrounding districts. Thus the minister-bishops of the larger cities were in the way of becoming over-bishops, and later to become diocesan bishops or patriarchs. One can notice such a development taking place with regard to the leaders of the churches in the large cities of the Roman Empire. In a ~~process~~ ^{process} of this kind it would have been surprising if the head minister of the church in Rome, the imperial capital, had not become more and more influential, and acquire more and more authority. This in fact was the case with the bishops of Rome. And, indeed, one after another claimed, and worked and schemed for, more and more power in the Church at large, till at last the Roman bishop, or Pope as he came

(1) Cf. Lindsay- "The Church and Ministry in the Early Centuries". pp.259,260.

I. Introduction.

to be called, had succeeded in establishing his headship over the whole of Western Christendom. By the time this had come to pass we have entered well into that period of political and religious history which is called the Middle Ages.

This period is said to date roughly from the Middle of the Fifth Century onwards to the end of the Fifteenth Century. During the course of these centuries the Ministerial Order greatly changed. Indeed both Church and Ministry had developments which made them differ much in character from what we know of the Church in the first centuries. By the time we have reached the centuries preceding the Reformation, we see a great and imposing ecclesiastical organization which has come into being. The officials of the Church, the clergy as they are called, form a distinct ecclesiastical class, separated from the ordinary people or laity. The clergy are looked on as the Church proper; the laity are just a multitude, ecclesiastically lower than the clergy, and are a part of the Church chiefly by coming under the ministrations and the rule and authority of the Church in the persons of the clergy. The clergy themselves are in different ranks and classes of varying degrees of superiority and inferiority. It is a vast hierarchical system. At the head of the system is the Bishop of Rome, the Pope. Immediately under him are those who may be spoken of as forming his court, the princes of the Church, the Cardinals. These are mainly drawn from, and resident in, Italy. In every country the Church is organized with a certain uniformity. There are archbishops, bishops, canons,

I. Introduction.

rectors, vicars, mass priests, and various other ranks and degrees. These are all under the authority of the Pope, the archbishops and bishops being directly appointed by him. It has to be said, however, that secular rulers were inclined to dispute the Pope's authority in these appointments. In England, for example, the Statute of Provisors was enacted in 1351 to try and curb the Pope's power in this respect.

Besides the ordinary clergy there was the great army of conventuals composed of communities living in abbeys and priories and friaries, and under the special rules and vows of the orders with which they were associated. Originally the monastic orders had been composed of laymen. It became later the custom for their members to be ordained to the priesthood. They were known as "Regulars" or "Regular Clergy" as they were under monastic rules and vows; while the ordinary clergy were called "Seculars" or "Secular Clergy" as being out in the world. The "Regulars" considered themselves superior to the "Seculars". Some of the abbots at the head of the greater abbeys held rank and episcopal power similar to that of archbishops and bishops.

It is clear, then, to what an extent the Ministry had changed from the days of the Primitive Church by the gradual introduction of such a state and system of ranks and degrees and varieties of clergy.

There may be variety in the Ministry with some advantage. Aquinas in dealing with what were called the Seven Orders, seeks to justify it- "Multiplicity of Orders was introduced into the Church for three reasons. First, to show forth the Wisdom of

I. Introduction.

God, which is reflected in the orderly distinction of things both natural and spiritual ----- Secondly, in order to succour human weakness, because it would be impossible for one man, without his being heavily burdened, to fulfil all things according to the Divine mysteries ----- Thirdly, that man may be given a broader way for advancing ----- duties divided among many men, so that all become the cooperators of God."(1). Probably Reformed Churchmen of our period would not have disagreed with the main contention here, that division of labour is advisable. But the state of having ranks and classes, official superiors and official inferiors, proud higher degrees lording over lower degrees, was another matter. No Reformed Churchman could forget the words- "Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles, exercise lordship over them: and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you."(Mk. X.42,43.)

There were two features in the Papal Church which were the means of binding the varied hierarchical system together. The one was the "succession" theory which was assumed in the doctrine of the priesthood. According to this all priests were held to derive the powers of their priestly office by ordination conferred by the bishops in fellowship with the Papal Church, who were supposed to be in a special succession from the Apostles. Running through all the ranks and classes and degrees and variety of clergy in the priesthood, alike popes, and archbishops and bishops, cardinals and canons, abbots and priors,

(1) Aquinas- The Sacrament of Order- Quaest. XXXVII.1.

I. Introduction.

regulars and seculars, monks and friars and parish priests, was this bond of a mysterious characteristic supposed to be derived from an "apostolic succession."

The other feature of the hierarchical system was a still more important means of binding the varied ranks together. All were in a common obedience under the high and supreme spiritual position and authority of the Pope, the Bishop of Rome. He claimed to be the vicar of Christ, and to have supreme authority in place of Christ over all the clergy in all lands. If the ordinary bishop and ordinary priest exercised power through an "apostolic succession", the Pope in addition stood in the line of a higher "succession". This was grounded on the assertions that Peter was the chief of the Apostles, and that he had been the first bishop of Rome, and that consequently all his successors in the bishopric of Rome inherited his apostolic supremacy which gave them chief power and authority in the Church. So superior was the position of the Popes that if any bishops and ordinary priests should get out of submissive touch with them in the "See-of-Peter-Succession", all their "apostolic succession" was liable to lose its validity and power.

This then was the imposing and closely-knit hierarchy into which the Ministry of the Church had become shaped before the end of the Middle Ages. It was under this form of the organization of the Church, with the doctrines supporting it and flowing from it, that the Reformation Movement of the Sixteenth Century began.

II. Historical Survey of the Constituting of the Ministerial Order of the Reformed Church.

The Reformation was the outcome of an earnest and determined questioning of all things connected with the Christian Religion and the Christian Church. It was driven on by the consciousness that much was wrong, and untrue, and corrupt, in the existing Church and current beliefs. "All over Europe , the Church, its doctrines, its ritual, its ceremonies, its ministers, were being brought to the bar of public criticism."(1). The earnest critical attitude was due to the increased opportunities for learning which the times presented, with the consequent new intellectual activities, together with a revival of religion sustained and enlightened by the rediscovery of the Holy Scriptures. The Bible was becoming the religious handbook and guide for many, both high and low, ecclesiastics and laymen. New views about religious matters and suggestions for reform became widely current and largely accepted. Erasmus has depicted life-like illustrations of this in his "Colloquies". Thus the religious upheaval of the Reformation took place. A great doctrinal and ecclesiastical revolutionary movement was brought about. Earnest and devoted leaders arose in the cause of reform. They strove to abolish abuses, to revise and change doctrines and religious customs and practices, to purge methods of worship and religious exercises and duties from what they were convinced was wrong; and to reform church organizations and institutions; and to reconstitute authorities; all in accordance with the new light which had come to them.

(1) Reyburn- "John Calvin", p.16.

II Historical Survey.

Of necessity it could not be, in face of so much criticism, and amidst the ecclesiastical upheaval, and the reconstruction which was beginning, that the Ministerial Order as found in the Mediaeval Papal Church, would escape the general reforming zeal, and it did not. It was in this sphere that some of the most drastic changes took place. By all the churches of the Reformation the Pope was utterly renounced, and by most the whole hierarchical system which was bound up with him was definitely rejected. The papal ministerial orders were felt to be corrupt and rotten from the highest to the lowest. And in noticing the judgement passed upon the Mediaeval Ministerial Order by the Reformation leaders, we must bear in mind that it was passed by men who were familiar with it in a way impossible for even scholars of the present day. They had been brought up in the Church under that Ministry. Many of them were in that Ministry themselves before they were Reformers. The pressure of their religious convictions compelled them to examine its nature and character most carefully. It was a momentous decision they had to take. If they were already in it (as Luther, and Zwingli, and Knox, and others) could they rightly remain in it ? If they were not yet in it, would it be right for them to go forward and enter upon the ministerial positions so likely to open up for them (as was the case with Calvin) ? When they rejected that Ministerial Order, they knew what they were losing, and what they were rejecting, and why they were rejecting it.

We have to notice one noteworthy fact. The Reformers

II. Historical Survey.

who were the leaders in the main Reformation movements, when renouncing and opposing themselves to the Pope and his hierarchy, and setting aside the Mediaeval Church Orders, did not in the least reject a Ministerial Order and seek to abolish the Ministry as an institution in the Christian Church. They might have done so. The Reformation was a revolution. Much was being cast down. The Order of the Ministry might have been thus treated, and might have been rejected in every form. There were tendencies of that kind at work in the commotion of the times, to decry and denounce any order of Ministry in the Church. But the great Reformation leaders, not only saw the usefulness of having an Order of Ministry for the Churches of the Reformation which were being constituted, but they believed in its immense importance and divine sanction.

There was, indeed, a belief which was very strongly held by the Reformers, which might have negated a Ministerial Order entirely. This was the belief in the priesthood of all believers. It was a tenet which the Reformers could not depart from. They did not wish to depart from it. In Scripture study they had discovered it with joy. As a doctrine it helped to emancipate them from the claims made for the Papal priesthood. Luther, especially at the beginning of his work for reform, emphasised greatly this doctrine. In his "Address to the German Nobility" he says-"It has been devised ^{that} ~~by~~ the Pope, bishops, priests and monks are called the spiritual estate. This is an artful lie and hypocritical device, but let no man be made

II. Historical Survey.

afraid by it, and that for this reason; that all Christians are truly of the spiritual estate, and there is no difference among them, save of office alone ----- As for the unction by a Pope or a bishop, tonsure, ordination, consecration, and clothes differing from those of laymen- all this may make a hypocrite or an anointed puppet, but never a Christian or a spiritual man. Thus we are all consecrated as priests by baptism, as St. Peter says- Ye are a royal priesthood, a holy nation - I Pet. II.9.- and in the book of Revelation - and hast made us unto our God- by Thy blood- kings and priests- Rev.V.10. For, if we had not a higher consecration in us than pope or bishop can give, no priest could ever be made by the consecration of pope or bishop, nor could he say the Mass or preach, or absolve."(1). Calvin is giving his expression to the same adherence to the priesthood of all believers when he writes- "All who received this training (for the Ministerial Office) were designated by the general name of Clerks. I could wish that some more appropriate name had been given them, for this appellation had its origin in error, or at least, improper feeling, since the whole Church is by Peter denominated - clerus - that is the inheritance of the Lord.- I Pet.V.3. (2) All the Reformers held by this same doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. It was one of the governing principles of all their views on church and ministry.

Yet although there was the firm adherence to this doctrine, it did not lead them to have no convictions as to the necessity and excellence of a special ministerial Order in the Church. (1) Wace & Buchheim, pp.164,165. (2) Institutes. IV.IV. 9.

II. Historical Survey.

On the contrary they were firmly persuaded of the great value of the Ministry to the Church. It may be ^{that} Luther did not at first lay so much stress on the absolute need of a distinctive office, nor on the view that there were duties to be performed in the Church which could only be fulfilled through an Order of the Ministry. But later, when he saw disorders arising through all kinds of people taking it upon them to preach, his views regarding duties belonging to a ministerial order became stricter. But even where in the above quoted passage he is so emphatically pointing out that all believers are priests unto God, yet he is making the necessary reservations to secure the Ministry its place. He remarks- "For since we are all priests alike, no man may put himself forward or take upon himself without our consent and election, to do that which we have all alike power to do."(1). There need be no doubt that Luther considered the Christian ministry of the highest importance. His encouraging of Visitations for inspecting the condition of the churches and ascertaining how far the ministers were doing their work; his seeking that only the best men should be admitted into the ministry; the simple but impressive ordination service which he drew up, which became the model one for Lutheran Churches; the influence which he exercised on those of his own time and for the future in the Lutheran Churches to seek to train and maintain a worthy ministry; all such considerations go to show his high estimation of the Ministry.

(1) Wace & Buchheim, p.164.

II. Historical Survey.

When we come to the Reformed Church movement, we find that the high appreciation of the Ministry becomes, if anything, clearer. At the first Zwingli has it- "Gott hatte es unter seinem Volk angeordnet, dass immer das Prophetenamt, d.i., die himmlische Lehre, vorhanden sey."(1). He ~~quite holds by~~ ^{fully accepts} the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers, but he sees there must be the special office of the Ministry- "Es ist waar wir sind all gewycht (geweiht) gnug zu der pfauffheyt (Priesterstand, Priestertum), die im nuwen ~~testament opffret~~ testament opffret; dann die ist nuts (nichts) anders, weder da ein yeder sich selbs opfret, Rom.XII (Rom.XII.1). Aber wir sind ye nit all apostel und bischoff, I Cor XII"(I Cor.XII.29.)-(2). This which Zwingli expresses so early in the history of the Reformed Churches is later in the Second Helvetic Confession, 1566, stated with admirable clearness- "Nuncupant sane apostoli Christi omnes in Christum credentes sacerdotes, sed non ratione ministerii, sed quod per Christum, omnes fideles facti reges et sacerdotes, offerre possumus spirituales Deo hostias. Diversissima ergo inter se sunt sacerdotium et ministerium. Illud enim commune est Christianis omnibus, ut modo diximis, hoc non item. Nec e medio sustulimus ecclesiae ministerium, quando repudiavimus ex ecclesia Christi sacerdotium papisticum". (3)

The Reformed Churchmen ~~indeed taught~~ ^{did indeed teach} the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers, but they also taught that drawn from, and in the midst of, that priesthood, was to be an Order of

(1) Usteri & Vogelín, Vol.II.p.285.

(2) Zwingli- Von den Predigamt.

(3) Niemeyer, p.259.

II. Historical Survey.

men to serve the Church in spiritual things.

It may be profitable to look at statements which witness to the exalted notions held as to the nature and character of the Ministry. What strong views are expressed in the Genevan Confession of 1537- "Or comme nous recevons les vrais ministres de la Parole de Dieu comme messagers et ambassadeurs de Dieu, lesquels il faut écouter comme lui-meme, et réputons leur ministère être une commission de Dieu nécessaire en l'Eglise.⁽¹⁾" Very high views of the Ministry are those which Calvin gives. Because of their importance it will be well to quote them with some fulness- "Christ ascended up far above all heavens, that He might fill all things - Eph.IV.10.- The mode of filling is this: By the ministers to whom He has committed this office, and given grace to discharge it, He dispenses and distributes His grace to the Church, and thus exhibits Himself as in a manner actually present by exerting the energy of His Spirit in this His institution, so as to prevent it from being vain or fruitless. In this way the renewal of the saints is accomplished, and the body of Christ is edified, in this way we grow up in all things unto Him Who is the Head, and unite with one another; in this way we are all brought into the unity of Christ, provided prophecy flourishes among us, provided we receive His apostles, and despise not the doctrine which is administered to us. Whosoever, therefore, studies to abolish this order and kind of government of which we speak, or disparages it as of minor importance, plots the devastation, or rather the

(1) Meyer. p.259.

II. Historical Survey.

ruin and destruction of the Churches."(1). These closing words especially show how far Calvin was from having any thought of there being a true Church without the Ministerial Order. In fact he considered it indispensable. And the whole passage gives us his high conception of the value of the Ministry to the Church. We can add these other words from his Commentary on Ephesians, which bring out some other points along the same lines- "True pastors do not rashly thrust themselves forward by their own judgement, but are raised by the Lord. In short, the government of the Church by the ministry of the Word is not a contrivance of men, but an appointment made by the Son of God ----- They who reject or despise this ministry, offer insult and rebellion to Christ its author."(2).

A few more representative testimonies to the high value set on the Ministry are the following. This is from the French Confession of 1559- "Or pource que nous iouissons de Iésus Christ que par l'Évangile, nous croyons que l'ordre de l'Église, qui a esté établi en son autorité, doit estre sacré et inviolable. Et pourtant que l'Église ne peut consister sinon qu'il y ait des pasteurs qui ayent le charge d'enseigner, lesquels on doit honorer et escouter en révérence quand ils sont deument appelés, et exercent fidèlement leur office. Non pas que Dieu soit attaché à telles aides ou moyens inférieur, mais pource qu'il luy plaist nous entretenir sous

(1) Calvin- Inst. Bk.IV. Chap.III.2.

(2) Calvin- Com. Ephes.IV.11.

II. Historical Survey.

telle charge et bride. En quoy nous détestons tous fantastiques qui vouldroyent bien, entant qu'en eux est, anéantir le ministère et prédication de la parole de Dieu et ses sacremens".(1).

Another testimony we take from John A'lasco's Church Order of 1550- "Gleich wie ein Haus one Haussvater, ein Schiff one Stewerman, ^{und} ~~als~~ ein Heer one Hauptmann, im gewisse Gefahr kommen, also auch die Gemeine Christi, welche in dieser Welt streitet, wird entheiligt, zerissen und vergehet endlich gar, wo sie ire gebürliche Regierer und diener nit hat, durch welcher ernst, Gottes Furch und Lehre sie billich sol regieret werden." (2)
This is almost in the strain of Ignatius in his strenuous advocacy of "bishops".

From Scotland we receive this testimony. It occurs in a message of "The Superintendents, Ministers and Commissioners of the Churches Reformed within this Realme of Scotlande to all the Faithful of Scotland, 25th. Decr. 1565", and is as follows- "The Ministers of Jesus Christ have an office without al comparison more excellent (Than that of Jewish priests and Levites), for they bring to us the glad tidings of salvation, by the two edged sworde of Goddes worde, which is mighty in operation, they slay that old man that ever fightes against God, they make his thought patent to his own confusion that the new man of God maye take lyfe. They wash the soules with the bloude of Jesus Christe which abundantly drops from their lips -----If we think that al these things may be due

without ministers or without preaching, we utterly deceyve

(1) Art. XXV. Kidd, p.669. Niemeyer, p.322.

(2) Richter, Vol.II. p.99.

II. Historical Survey.

ourselves. For the same order that God hath observed since that he hath collected his visible Church, he will shall be observed so long as it continueth upon the face of the earth".(1)

It is perfectly plain from these statements, which are only a few among many of a like kind, that the Reformed Church Movement began its great reconstructive work with full persuasion of the necessary place of a ministerial order in the Church. It was opposed to the "no-official-ministry" views of the varied revolutionary sections among the Anabaptists. It would have been in opposition to the practices of the "ministerless" Christian communities of later times, such as the Society of Friends and the Plymouth Brethren. And the convictions concerning the high value of the Ministry, we may notice here, continued with Reformed Churchmen on into the later times of our period. The following words, taken from one of the latest pronouncements, that of the London Provincial Assembly of 1654, shows this- "The Necessity and Excellency of the Gospel Ministry is so transcendently great, as that it cannot but be accounted a very glorious service in all those that shall undertake to represent it in all its Beauty to the Sonnes of men, and to vindicate it from all that seek to asperse, undermine and destroy it. Our Saviour Christ when He ascended up into Heaven, left the Ministry as His choisest legacy next to the Gift of his holy Spirit; he gave unto his ministers - which he gave to no earthly monarch - the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, he committed to them the Word of Reconciliation,

(1) Laing's Knox. Vol.VI. p.433.

II. Historical Survey.

he made them Stewards of the Mysteries of God, and Watchmen over the precious souls of his people. There is hardly anything necessary for man in his Natural and Civil Relation, but the Ministry is compared to it &c. &c."(1).

The matter of a Ministry for the Reformed Churches had to be taken in hand at once by the Reformed Leaders. What was the manner of the Ministry to be ? Some of the leaders were, or, perhaps to speak more correctly, had been in Papal Orders. But they thought little of that. They turned away from the whole Papal hierarchy. At first they were probably not quite clear in their minds as to all the implications of the kind of Ministry they were in course of instituting. It would require time and the experience gained in the exercising of that Ministry to show forth all that did and must belong to it. One great guiding principle was that which we have already noticed, the priesthood of all believers. This was sufficient to prevent any tendency to turn the Reformed Order into a special priestly order. And it may be remarked here, it was this principle too, clearly understood, which contributed to prevent the Churches of the Reformation denying the validity of the Ministry of each other. Whatever deep differences Lutheran and Reformed Churches had as regards the Lord's Supper, they did not deny each other's Ministry, even though the ministers might be unwilling to fraternize on account of those bitter differences of belief about the Supper. Among the Churches of Switzerland, ^{although} ~~even though~~ in general the Reformed

(1) "Jus Divinum M.E." Preface.

II. Historical Survey.

doctrines and polity were supported by all, yet because there was no uniform method of appointing ministers in the several Swiss Cantons, the authorities in each canton might have looked askance at the ministers from each other's areas, but they certainly did not do so. Ministers, when desired, passed from one canton to another with the full status of a minister. Calvin, writing to the Pastors of Bern in 1549, has these sentences in his letter- "For since we both preach the same Christ, both profess the same Gospel, are both members of the same church, and have both the same ministry" &c. &c.(1). And not only was a common ministry recognized among the Swiss Churches, but among all the Reformed Churches of Switzerland, Germany, France, Holland, England, and Scotland, and elsewhere. We can well believe that the doctrine of the priesthood of all ~~believers~~ believers, preventing the formation of a sacerdotal caste in any of the Churches, favoured a commonly accepted Ministry.

The great formative factor, however, at work in the instituting of the Reformed Ministry was the word of the Scriptures. The Reformers accepted the Scriptures as their guide-book, and almost as their book of rules. They found in the Bible that which persuaded them of the Divine sanction for the Ministerial Order in the Church, and also they ^{believed that they} could discover in it directions for the making and regulating of the Ministry. The Ministry ^{must be} ~~was~~ founded on what was believed to be set forth in the Bible. The Reformers largely drew up their

(1) Calvin- Lett. Vol.II. pp.200,201.

II. Historical Survey.

regulations for the Ministry, and formulated their doctrines in general about it, from the Book. Following this line they sought to discover all that was possible about church polity and the office of the ministry in the New Testament. They did not indeed refuse other helps. Calvin himself is said to have been one of the best scholars of his time in the writings of the Fathers, and he used them to support his views when necessary. But ~~it was~~ the Scriptures ^{were accepted} ~~which were taken~~ as the authoritative source from which to receive knowledge what the true ministry must be and must do.

It has already been remarked that the full implications of the Reformed Ministry would hardly be seen and understood at first. It was Calvin, guiding himself by the Scriptures, who was chiefly used to give that ministry its well defined character. He saw the need of it having proper regulations. The Jesuit Order had been founded in 1534, a most highly disciplined body. It would not do to have the Reformed Ministry full of irregularities, and with no rules to go upon to keep it in order. Besides, Calvin's mind loved order and had a genius for it. There must be that which, when the true Ministry was formed, would clearly bring out what ~~the true ministry~~ was its character and would preserve the type. The writer in the Cambridge Modern History, the late Principal A.M. Fairbairn, speaking of Calvin and the "Ordonnances" of Geneva, seems very truly ^{on the whole} to describe the situation and Calvin's part in meeting it- "The Reformed Ministry had till now been very largely the creation of conversion or inspiration, or chance, and the result could

II. Historical Survey.

not be termed satisfactory. Convinced men had found their way into it, and had created a conviction as sincere and an enthusiasm as vehement as their own; but along with them had also come hosts of restless men, moved by superficial and often ignoble causes:- discontent, petulance, discomfort, the desire to legitimise illegitimate connections, dislike to authority, and the love of change. And they had proved most mischievous forces in the Protestant Churches, had continued restless, had become ~~ambitious~~ seditious, impracticable, schismatic, authors of disorder and enemies of peace, who arrested progress and made men ashamed of change. Calvin had had his own experience of these men; and he, as a man of grave and juristic mind, had found the experience disagreeable, and was to find it more disagreeable still. With the insight of a genius he perceived that the battle could be won, not by chance recruits, but only by a disciplined army; and in order that the army might be created, he invented the discipline. The Ordinances may indeed be termed a method for making and guiding a Reformed ministry, a clergy that, without any priestly character, should yet be more efficient than the ancient priesthood".(1). That is well stated, except that perhaps it gives the impression of a greater number of unworthy men seeking the ministry than ~~would be the~~ ^{there actually} ~~were~~ ^{of} in the early days ~~of~~, at any rate, the Reformed Church Ministry. It had little to offer them in most countries except poverty or persecutions, and such conditions would tend to

(1), Cambridge Modern History. Vol.II. p.370.

II. Historical Survey.

restrain unworthy ones from entering it. Yet some did get in everywhere. It was Calvin with his regulations for selections, and "trials", and elections and approvals and authorisations, with respect to candidates for the Ministry, ^{designed} to shut out the unsuitable and unworthy and admit the approved men, who gave a distinctive character to the Reformed Ministry. It was made an Order of a definite kind, the general features of which were adopted throughout the Reformed Churches, and have largely persisted to the present time.

It might be expected that the characteristics of the Reformed Ministry would ~~have~~ vary greatly in the several countries where the Reformed Church was organized. The Church polity or organization ^{arose} ~~existed~~ under very different circumstances in the different countries, consider, for example, the circumstances in France and England and Scotland; and ^{those varying circumstances} ~~that fact~~ would be likely to have some modifying effect on the Ministry. In some respects the ~~outward~~ style of the Ministry might vary according to the outward conditions, for some conditions might favour a scholarly, or military, or political, or martyr type. As an example one ^{can} quote Motley's account of one of a military type- "An aristocratic sarcasm could not be levelled against Peregrine ~~de la~~ de la Grange, of a noble family in Provence, with the fiery blood of Southern France in his veins, brave as his nation, learned, eloquent, enthusiastic, who galloped to his field-preaching on horseback, and fired a pistol-shot as a signal for his congregation to give attention."(1). Yet considering the

(1) Motley- "The Rise of the Dutch Republic". Pt.II. Chap.VI.

II. Historical Survey.

very different political conditions and other varying circumstances^{to} which the Reformed Ministry along with the Church Polity were subjected in the several countries, it is noteworthy that the essential character of the Ministry exhibited itself much the same. The varying conditions but served to enable the ~~Min~~ Ministry the better to realise itself. Its reactions to its environments brought out more strongly its essential nature.

It will be well to consider^{briefly} the conditions under which the Reformed Ministerial Order had to exercise itself while the Reformed Churches were endeavouring to settle themselves in the several countries. The Polity of the Reformed Churches began to take form first in Switzerland. No doubt the general character of it owes something to the form of government of the Swiss States. They were republics, and the Reformed Church system embodied in it something of a republican character. There have often arisen difficulties in the relations between Church and State. Probably it would be always easier for a republican Church and a republican State (a constitutional kingly rule is much the same) to work harmoniously together, than for a monarchic (using monarchic in the strict sense) Church and a republican State, or a republican Church and a monarchic State, to work well together. Now in Switzerland, as the States and the Reformed Churches were of the republican type, Church and State, except for minor struggles in adjusting themselves to each other, worked well together. What elsewhere would have been looked on as one interfering with the other, was there rather regarded as one helping the other. A minister

II. Historical Survey.

could in general quite comfortably be partly under the State and partly under the Church without any sacrifice of principle..

It was very different in those countries which were monarchical. There the rulers appear to have had a fear and a jealousy of the Reformed Church system. It seemed to them to be the erecting of a state within the state, and a setting up of governments and judicatories in rivalry to the secular authorities, which might curb and hinder, or even overthrow the monarchical rule. There is no doubt that in France, England, and Scotland, there were fears among the rulers and statesmen that the Reformed Church system might prove, at the very least, awkward for their rule, and might even be dangerous to their monarchical constitution. We can find abundant evidence of such as this. There is the well known saying of James VI of Scotland, after he had also become king of England- "Presbytery agrees as well with monarchy as God and the devil." However, we cannot go into this. ^{But we} ~~But we~~ have to notice that this fear or jealousy of the Reformed Church system was one of the causes which moved would-be autocratic monarchs to oppose the Reformed Church in their lands. If these rulers were still Roman Catholic, they joined the more eagerly in assisting the Papal authorities to destroy the Reformed Church, or, ^{the} at least, they refused to grant ^{it} protection from the fierce hostility of the Roman Church. If the rulers had thrown off the Papal authority, as was the case in England and Scotland, then their aim was to prevent the Reformed Church from functioning, or to set up some other kind of Church system. These conditions

II. Historical Survey.

not only had grave consequences for the Reformed Church organization wherever they existed, but also by the interferences with the functioning of the Church, the Ministry could not exercise its full characteristics.

In France for more than two centuries the Reformed Church was either destructively persecuted or subjected to all manner of unjust treatment. In Hungary the Reformed Church suffered similarly. In other countries ~~there~~ also it had to endure much opposition and persecution. One can say, however, that the dangers and sufferings which persecution and oppression entailed often produced a fine and heroic class of men in the Ministry. Their heroism was frequently shown in one of its highest forms, that of calm patient endurance, a readiness to submit to humiliations and indignities from the hostile authorities, yielding as far as they might in loyalty to secular rulers, yet being prepared to witness faithfully and to uphold the cause to which they had devoted themselves, even unto death.

In Scotland and in England, the Reformed Church and its Ministry did not escape the infliction of hardships and persecutions from opposing monarchs. In England, as all know, there was persecution of the Protestants in the reign of Mary; and Scotland had its martyrs in the early years of its Reformation. But at the beginning in neither country were there such sufferings inflicted on the Protestants comparable in cruelty with those in France, Belgium, Holland, and Hungary. Neither Scotland nor England had a St. Bartholomew massacre. That terrible blow, which struck the French Church in 1572, filled all the

II. Historical Survey.

Reformed Churches with horror, but only in France was the keen suffering and loss felt. As for Scotland, the severest struggle for the Reformed Church did not take place till the Seventeenth Century, and then there were the many martyrs of the Covenant. In England, although not ~~being~~ subjected to the most extreme persecution, the Reformed Church Party had a painful and almost hopeless conflict all along, with sufferings harsh enough at times. It had a very brief partial ascendancy at the time of the Civil War and the Commonwealth. Then on another St. Bartholomew's Day, in the year 1662, over two thousand Reformed Church ministers, for conscience sake, had to leave their livings, and in many cases thereafter, with wives and families, were in extreme poverty. This almost destroyed the Reformed Church cause in England. In Scotland, however, after the sufferings of the covenanting times, the Reformed Church was once more raised up and took its place as the National Church of Scotland.

We will look at the struggles in England and in Scotland more closely. In each of these countries we have to notice that it was not the opposition of the Papal Church which brought about the longest and severest struggles for the Reformed Church cause. The Protestants of these countries were early delivered from the cruel hostility of Rome. Their governments became Protestant and persecutions by the Papal Church were made impossible. But the Reformed Church had its severe struggles against nominally Protestant monarchs, ^{and against} ~~and~~ a prelatie episcopal church system, ~~which was itself a product of the Reformation~~

II. Historical Survey.

which was favoured and established by the monarchs. It was in these struggles that the nature and character of the Reformed Ministry, in distinction from prelacy and other forms of ministerial Order, came out more clearly. From the arguments and statements and pronouncements and confessions and documents of various kinds, which were published during all the years of controversy and conflict, we obtain some of our most enlightening evidence as to what the Reformed Ministerial Order was and stood for.

It will be convenient to look at the course of affairs in England first. During the reign of Henry VIII, the Church, as then constituted, was separated from the Papal rule and authority. This was Henry's doing which, we may say, he effected when by an Act passed in 1534, he had himself declared to be the supreme Head of the Church of England. He was ^{not} evangelically becoming a Protestant. He maintained the Church in much the same form as hitherto with regard both to hierarchy and ceremonial. What he chiefly did was to cast off the authority of the Pope. When this was brought about, the idea of a hierarchy without the Pope was made familiar to the minds of English Churchmen, and has been operative in the Church of England ever since.

But although Henry could not be called a Protestant, his attitude with regard to the Pope could not fail to assist the Reformation in England and prepare the way for its advance. Protestantism, moreover, was increasing in effectiveness for advancing in most countries. Two most important documents for establishing its teaching had been given to the world in these years

II. Historical Survey.

the Augsburg Confession in 1530, and the first editions of Calvin's "Institutes" in 1536 and 1539, a work famous for its theology and constructive churchmanship. The Reformation movement continued to advance in England. In the reign of Edward VI, 1547-1557, it made much progress and was of an increasingly thorough kind. The king and his counsellors were becoming imbued with doctrines and principles of the Reformed or Calvinistic Church type. Cranmer, the Archbishop of Canterbury, seems to have been influenced more and more by Reformed Church views. In 1549 a new service-book for use in the Church was brought out. "It was an honest attempt to get rid of mediaeval corruptions".(1). A revised edition was issued in 1552 which was still more Protestant.

With Mary's reign, 1553-1558, a return to the Papal Church took place, and the Protestants were persecuted. Many fled from the country and took refuge in safe Protestant places on the Continent. Again a change in the religious affairs took place with the death of Mary and the accession of Elizabeth. She favoured the Protestant cause, and once more the Pope was renounced and reformation was carried forward in the Church.

A most curious situation was brought about at the beginning of Elizabeth's reign. Hitherto the outward aspect of the government of the Church had remained the same during the three preceding reigns. It had continued to be a hierarchy with archbishops and bishops. When Elizabeth came in as a

(1) First & Second Prayer Books of Ed. VI.- Everyman's Library, Preface.

II. Historical Survey.

Protestant ruler, the Church was left without archbishops, and practically without any acting bishops. This might have been a most favourable state of affairs for the adoption of the Reformed Church system. And towards that some strong forces were working. The Protestant refugees were returning from the Continent. They had lived in Strasburg, Frankfurt, Basel, and notably, Zürich, and Geneva. In these places it was the Reformed Church ^{with which} they had come ^{into} ~~in~~ close contact ~~with~~. They had become imbued with its principles. Some had been in personal touch with Bullinger and Calvin. When they went back to their own country most of them had desires of carrying out, as regards both Church and Ministry, the principles and ideals of the Reformed Church. These, and many young ^{men} being trained in the Universities, as well as not a few of the leading scholars, who were of their party, began to form a numerous and learned section in the Church of England. Some of the leading statesmen, also, were not by any means unsympathetic. And Parliament was prepared to ~~take~~ take up their cause. There can be little doubt that the Reformed Church ideals had more than mere possibilities of being realized in the Church of England.

But Elizabeth had no favour for such church organization. She was not a thorough-going Protestant personally. She was not decidedly against Mediaeval usages and forms in the Church. She is said to have had a decided taste for ostentation and display and ceremonial in church services. The Reformed Ministry could not please her for it was essentially unsuited to pomp and display. And the Reformed Church services would not

II. Historical Survey

meet her tastes, for they were deliberately characterised by the minimum of ceremonial. Besides she had her father's imperious spirit, and she naturally moved to take over her father's policy of being head of the Church of England, though she did not adopt the same grandiloquent title in ~~the~~^{that} connection. Her imperiousness was sufficient to make her antagonistic to a reconstruction of the Church on Reformed Church lines. There seemed to be in the very nature of the doctrine and polity of the Reformed Church something which made its adherents unable to be too submissive, although ever ready to be loyal under God to a secular ruler or government. The Reformed Churches had a high theory of the freedom and liberty of the Church with respect to the concerns of the Church. In that they had some likeness to the Papal Church, and an accusation to that effect was often brought against them. But there was this great difference between the respective tenets. In principle and in practice the Papal Church sought not only to rule itself and have freedom to manage its own church concerns, it also claimed to rule over the secular powers in their own departments. In principle the Reformed ~~church~~ Churches only desired to have freedom to rule themselves, and to have liberty in distinctly church matters. Yet there was a ^{certain} decided independence of secular ~~authority~~ sovereignty and domination belonging to them. Elizabeth would have none of that. All must be subject to her.

Thus Elizabeth determined with all her royal authority to establish a hierarchical and prelatie Church. She had new archbishops and bishops appointed. Then she and the

II. Historical Survey.

church dignitaries, whom she chose to act subserviently under her, set themselves to overthrow the Reformed Church movement. They employed stern repressive measures to crush it. The Reformed Churchmen had cherished great hopes. It was a deep disappointment to them to find all their proposals and projects received in this way. But they could not cease their efforts. They believed that the Church Polity and Ministerial Order, of which they were advocating the adoption in the English Church, were the only Scriptural institutions, and were such as Christ had directed. So the conflict went on and continued throughout the reign of Elizabeth. She compelled her bishops to be active and severe against the Reformed Churchmen and all Puritans. Some of her bishops were not very willing to go to extremes against their brethren, for they had been in some cases refugees^e on the Continent together, and had come under the same Reformed influences. But the Queen would not have them hesitate. And when Parliament would have favoured the Reformed party, she overruled it. She had laws passed of such a kind as to drive the Puritans out of the Church. They were deprived of their livings. They were imprisoned. Strict measures were taken to prevent the printing and circulating of their literature either by way of defence or propaganda. And yet documents and tracts were printed and issued. Of these one may name here as being important- "The Admonition to Parliament", of 1571, the "Directory or Book of Discipline" of 1583, and the "Marprelate Tracts" of 1588-1590. The last named were not of Presbyterian authorship, so far as can be known, but they

II. Historical Survey.

attacked the abuses which the Reformed Church party condemned and were seeking to have removed.

Neither appeals ~~nor~~ nor attacks made any difference in the policy pursued by the dominant party. As for the Church rulers, they were becoming as time went on less impressionable to any idealistic appeals. The later Elizabethan archbishops and bishops had become attached to the power, pomp, and wealth, which ~~prelacy~~ a prelatic Church provided for them, and which they knew would be impossible in a Reformed Church. The rank and file of the clergy were of a very mixed kind as may be seen from the following description occurring in the Presbyterian "Admonition to Parliament" of 1571- "We allow, and like wel of popish masse mongers, men for all seasons, Kyng Henries priestes, King Edwards priests, Queene Maries priestes, who of a truth - yf God's worde were precisely followed - should from the same be utterly removed." This probably gives a fairly correct impression of the composition of the English Church ministry at that time. There was difficulty in supplying the parishes with incumbents, and this was being made more difficult because worthy men were being put out, and some of the best men of the Reformed Church party were not being permitted to enter the Ministry. So turn-coats from all the previous periods were being retained, and there was not sufficient care as to the worthiness of those who were being admitted. Clergy of this character were not of the kind to respond to ideals such as the Reformed Churchmen would present to them. It was not from them that recruits or supporters or sympathisers

II. Historical Survey.

were likely to be obtained. They were more on the look out for what would provide them with a position of ease and comfort. Perhaps if the Reformed Church Party had gained the ascendancy in the Church, for personal advantage some of these clergy would have crossed over to it and joined it. That, however, was not to be. It was increasingly harried by the Queen and her ecclesiastical supporters. It was not likely that self-seekers and lovers of position and comfort would cast in their lot with it despite persuasive appeals to reason and to conscience. Thus the Reformed Party could not gain consideration or add to its numbers. It was persecuted and oppressed and worn down. It lost ground. It was not, however, completely destroyed, as we shall see. It was only partly subdued and forced under for a season, biding its time till there might arise
~~come~~ more favourable opportunities to assert itself anew.

The Reformed Church Party within the Church of England has been accused of being "a hostile force, determined to do away with the existing system of polity and worship in the English Church." (1). This is hardly a fair statement. The existing system was in a state of transition. The very Prayer Book was comparatively new, and had not reached its final revision. The Church of England was in the melting-pot. In fact the whole of the Church system of Western Europe was in the same condition. And in England there was no absolutely settled

(1) Frere & Douglas. "Puritan Manifestoes",
Intro. p.VII.

II. Historical Survey.

church system as yet arrived at. It was more or less in a fluid state. The doctrines of the Church and the Order of the Ministry had not been strictly defined. Even the opponents of the Puritans had not reached thoroughly clear and settled views as to what kind of church and ministry they would favour. The Ministry might be reformed, and the Church might be remoulded, in a variety of ways. The Reformed Churchmen were only seeking to reform the Ministry and to remould ^{the Church} in one way according to their convictions. They might be wrong, but there was nothing different in their attempt from what others were attempting in the matter of reforming and remoulding in other places either after the same plan or a different one. Already on the Continent of Europe, in other ancient sections of the Mediaeval Church, thorough changes in Church and Ministry had been made. There had been brought about in certain cases a reforming and remoulding as full and complete as the Reformed Church Party in the Church of England was attempting, and under the same well recognized convictions. The Anglican style of church polity, having a hierarchy without the Pope, had not become so long and unquestioningly and rigidly established, as to be necessarily considered unchangeable and inviolable.

The Reformed Church Movement in the English Church has also, by the writers above cited, been described as a foreign importation. They remark- "The Puritan mind was the result of a transplantation, not a purely native growth, and though some of its characteristics were already latent in the English

II. Historical Survey.

character, others were new and more French and German than English."(1). It is not difficult to make a reply to statements of this kind. The Mediaeval Church, and what was allowed to remain of it in England by Henry VIII, and continued by Elizabeth in certain measure, can be said much more truly to be a foreign importation in England. It had come from Italy, and in many respects was characteristically Italian or Latin. But to talk about foreign transplantations and importations in connection with the Christian Religion needs care and circumspection, and a realization of all the implications of it. The Christian Religion has been an importation into all lands except Palaestine where it arose. The chief question for consideration with regard to all matters of religion is whether they are true or not. But if a discussion on national traits in religion were to be engaged in, a good case could probably be made for the assertion with regard to the Christian religion in England, that the more of Latin Mediaevalism there is in the Church, the fewer are the distinctive English traits. Because of the presence or absence, ^{as the case might be} of the Latin elements, it might well be contended that there are many more English traits in modern Methodism than in Modern Anglicanism. But to return to the point- it can safely be said that there was nothing more distinctively foreign in the church principles held by the Reformed Church Party than in those held by the Prelatic Church Party. Which had more of the truth in them, we do not here attempt to decide.

(1) Frere & Douglas. "Puritan Manifestoes", Introd. p.Vii.

II. Historical Survey.

One thing, however, is clear. The Reformed Churchmen believed they had the truth behind them in support of the principles for which they were contending, both with regard to the Church and the Ministry. For their views on the nature and character of the Ministry they felt assured that they had the Divine Authority of the teaching of the New Testament on the subject. These words of John Udall are typical- "God doth ~~describ~~ describe perfectly unto us out of his worde that forme of government which is lawfull, and the officers that are to execute the same; from which it is not lawful for any Christian Church to swarve."(1). And he was convinced that the Ministry and the Church, which he along with others was advocating, was of this kind. Udall sealed his convictions with a martyr's death. Opposition to, and persecution of, men with such convictions, only confirmed them the more in them. The controversy later assumed a somewhat different aspect. The insistence by Reformed Churchmen on the "Jus Divinum" of the Reformed Ministry was after a while, during the conflict, met by a "Jus Divinum" theory of Prelatic Episcopacy. This was when Bancroft, in his sermon at Paul's Cross in 1589, "broached for the first time (i.e. for the English Church after the Reformation) the Divine Right of Diocesan Episcopacy and connected it with Ministerial Orders and Sacramental grace".(2). Previously apologists for the English hierarchy had argued that a sovereign had the right to decide on the form of government for

(1) Udall. "A Demonstration of Discipline". p.17.

(2) Drysdale. "History of the Presbyterians in England". p.225.

II. Historical Survey.

the Church, whether it was to be prelatie or otherwise. Since Elizabeth desired prelatie bishops, she had the right to set them up.(1). This new claim of a Divine Right of prelatie ~~epi~~ episcopacy intensified the conflict between the two parties, and brought out more sharply the nature of the kind of ministry each was striving to uphold.

Meanwhile in Scotland the Reformed Church had been successfully struggling to establish itself. At the beginning the opposing forces were not the same as the Reformed Church Party had to encounter in England. There, as we have seen, a form of ^{the} Reformation was, on Elizabeth's accession, installed by the powers-that-be, and no other form was permitted. Hence the opponents of the Reformed Church Movement were a professing Protestant ruler along with the forces of the Reformation hierarchical Church which she had inaugurated. In Scotland, however, at first the Reformed Church had to meet the opposition of Roman Catholic rulers and the Papal Church. Its first decisive stroke of success was made when in 1560 the Scottish Parliament authorised the Reformed Confession of Faith, and abolished the censures of the Mediaeval Church, the jurisdiction of the Pope, and the celebration of the Mass.(2). The Church had now to organize itself. Many difficulties had to be faced. The country was turbulent. The remnants of the Papal Church never ceased plotting the overthrow of the Reformed Church. It was very

~~(1) Whitgift's Works. Vol.I. pp.258,259,184,185,198,218.~~
(1) Whitgift's Works. Vol.I. pp.258,259,184,185,198,218.

~~(2) Cunningham~~ (2) Cunningham. Vol.I. p.276.
Laing's Knox. Vol.II. p.122.et seq.

II. Historical Survey.

difficult to obtain a sufficient supply of Protestant ministers for all the parishes over the country. And there was further difficulty in procuring stipends for those ministers who were settled in charges, because the nobility and others were scrambling to seize all the wealth and revenues of the Mediaeval Church. The insufficient supply of ministers continued for a number of years.

In course of time the Church of Scotland became more fully organized. But it was not to be allowed to function freely as a Reformed Church without a struggle. When Morton became Regent, he set himself to bring in a kind of prelacy to suit certain projects. It required some manoeuvring. Some measure of success was attained for this by what was agreed to at the Convention of Leith in 1572 (or 73). From that time onwards a conflict went on between the favourers of ~~of~~ a prelatic episcopacy and the Reformed Church Party. It was engaged in during the reigns of James VI and Charles I. There were varying fortunes to both parties. Sometimes Presbytery was in the ascendant, at other times Prelacy was successful. James had come to be completely hostile to Presbytery, and when he had gained the additional power which he received on becoming king of England as well as of Scotland, he forced a prelacy on Scotland. This continued to rule in the Church of Scotland till the death of James, and was carried on more fervently and autocratically by his son Charles. At last the rising of the nation against the autocratic rule of Charles began. Then came the favourable opportunity once more for the Reformed Church Party.

II. Historical Survey.

At the Glasgow Assembly of 1638 and the succeeding one, prelacy was swept away and the Church of Scotland again became a Reformed Church with the Presbyterian polity.

Another opportunity also ~~came~~^{arose} for the Reformed Church Party in England. Both James and Charles had followed in the footsteps of Elizabeth in repressing the Puritans. The time^{came} when the rule of Charles was being challenged by Parliament and a large part of the people. During this period the English Parliament^{in 1643} abolished prelatic episcopacy. Thus Scotland and England had arrived at similar positions ecclesiastically. There was this also took place of the greatest importance. During this period the famous Westminster Assembly (1643-1652) held its meetings and issued some of the most valuable confessional documents of the Reformed Churches. These were accepted at the time both in England and Scotland. Yet matters did not go very prosperously for Presbytery in either country. Cromwell did not sanction the functioning of a Reformed Church in England. In Scotland he showed only a toleration of it. In 1653 the Assembly, by Cromwell's soldiers, was dissolved "sine die". In other respects there was not much interference with the affairs of the Church.

After the Restoration of Charles II, prelatic episcopacy was again established both in England and Scotland. In England this has continued to the present time. In Scotland when James VII & II had been compelled to abdicate, and William and Mary became the sovereigns of Great Britain, with the Revolution Settlement for the Scottish Church, the Reformed Church system was once more soundly established in Scotland.

II. Historical Survey.

A few words may be said here about Holland and France. As for Holland, the Synod of Dort (1618-1619) had confirmed the Dutch Protestant Church in the Calvinistic doctrines. The Protestant cause had owed much to the courage, ability, and self-denying patriotism of William of Orange. Before his death in 1584 the Reformed Church had become established in the land. In France there was no cessation of the sufferings of the Reformed Church under the persecutions of its royal and ecclesiastical enemies. The Edict of Nantes in 1598 made conditions somewhat easier for a while, yet for a considerable time before the revocation of that Edict in 1685, its terms were more and more disregarded or perverted, and the position of the Reformed Church was made increasingly intolerable. The set object of its enemies seems to have been to make it impossible for it to continue to exist. It was subjected to all manner of injustice and persecutions. The Revocation of the Edict was the culmination of all the underhand and illegal vexation and persecution of the Church ~~in~~^{by} publicly and formally making it legal to persecute it. After that the Church was almost overthrown. Protestant refugees left France by the hundred thousand and became an additional strength to the Reformed Churches of the lands to which they fled. But the Reformed Church in France was not completely extinguished. ~~Agreement~~ A remnant was left. It continued to struggle on without any rights. There were no church buildings left. They had all been destroyed. But faithful ministers went about ministering to scattered loyal adherents of the almost lost cause. Something of this kind went on for

II. Historical Survey.

about one hundred years until the Revolution in 1789 gave the French Reformed Church toleration and liberty. This carries us a long way beyond the period with which we at present ~~have~~ are ~~also~~ concerned.

There remains one other important doctrine of the Reformed Churches, having most important bearing on the theories and ideal character of the Ministry, which calls for notice here. It has special interest with reference to the struggle of Reformed Churchmen both in England and Scotland against a powerfully supported Prelatic Episcopacy, though it was not held only in these two countries. This was the doctrine that Christ is the head of the Church. It was one of the leading Reformed principles, for the doctrine translated itself into a church principle. It had the effect of keeping Reformed Churchmen steadfast in upholding, what they believed to be the will of Christ in His Church, against all other authorities presuming to dictate to, and govern, the Church. It was a principle which had been asserted from the beginning of the Swiss Reformation in opposition to the claims of ^{the} Headship over the Church of the Pope of Rome. It was affirmed in the First Helvetic Confession of 1536 as follows- "Dann Christus selbst allein das waar ond recht hopt und leerer siner kilchen ist, der selbig gibt siner kilchen, hirten und leerer, die uss sinem befelch das wort und gewalt der schusseln orderlich und rechtmassig, wie oben gemelt, furend."(1). Declarations as to Christ being the only

(1) Niemeyer. p.119.

II. Historical Survey.

universal bishop and head of the Church are also made in the French Confession of 1559, and the Belgic of 1561. Calvin and Knox and the other leaders held strongly by the Headship of Christ in His Church. It was this principle which sank deep down into the minds and hearts of all faithful ministers of the Reformed Churches. It has been said that "the central fact of Calvinism is the vision of God"(1), a vision which reveals His sovereignty and transcendence. It was the perception of this fact of the sovereignty of God which did so much to make the upholders of the Reformed cause strong to endure and firm to suffer. This no doubt is true. Just as truly we may say that it was central to the thought of Reformed Churchmen in all their ecclesiastical affairs, that Christ is King and Head of His Church. It was to them a sustaining and constraining belief. Inspired by it they strove for the right government of the Church, and they stood fast against ecclesiastical, royal, or civil, authorities, which they were persuaded were usurping in the Church the rule of Christ.

Nowhere was the full scope of the meaning of this doctrine brought out more clearly, nor loyalty to it more bravely displayed, than in the long struggle of the Reformed Church ministers in England and Scotland against powerful authorities arrayed against them. We have noticed that it was the same kind of prelatie episcopacy with which Reformed Churchmen were confronted both in Scotland and in England. It was largely a

(1) B.J.Warfield, D.D.- A Pamphlet, "Calvin as a Theologian"&c. 1909. p.15 et seq., p.27.

II. Historical Survey.

royal foundation and establishment. It was backed by all the authority of Elizabeth, of James VI & I, of Charles I, and of Charles II. Each in turn gave the support of the royal power to the prelatie ecclesiastical authorities. In spite of all, in the affairs of the Church, the Reformed ministers were persuaded Christ's authority must be supreme. This is true with regard to both England and Scotland. Professor Trevelyan in his History of England appears to be mistaken concerning England in this respect, where he says- "Towards the close of her (Elizabeth's) reign, and still more under her two successors, the Puritan party in the Church appealed to Parliament for help, and the Anglican party to the crown. Neither school of thought attempted to take up the high religious ground of the Scottish Church, which claimed to be entirely autonomous, and even to dictate on matters of policy to the feeble Scottish Parliament and to "God's silly vassal " the King. Rome and Geneva, Loyola and Knox, claimed for the Church freedom, and even superiority in relation to the State, the claims of Rome resting on sacerdotal authority, those of Geneva on religious democracy."(1). Now, in the first place, the writer is mistaken in supposing that Geneva rested its claim for the freedom of the Church "on religious democracy". The Genevan Reformers were far from doing so. These few words of Calvin, among others to like effect, are sufficient to show this- "Her (the Church's) only Head is Christ, under whose government we are all united

(1) Trevelyan. "History of England". p.330.

II. Historical Survey.

to each other, according to that order and form of policy which He Himself has prescribed."(1). The position of the Church, free or not, was rested on Christ. It was His Headship which carried with it a rightful freedom under Him for the Church quite apart from an assisting democracy or an opposing despotism. As for the Reformed Churchmen in England, they did hold strongly by this doctrine of Christ's Headship, carrying along with it a claim for a spiritual freedom for the Church and its Ministry. Take these words of Dudley Fenner, written in the middle years of Elizabeth's reign- "What meane ye firste to make her Majestie to clayme a power over the Church and conscience of men which not ~~only~~ onely the lawe of God, but not her own lawes giveth her ? which either must take the Crowne from the heade of Christe ----"(1587).⁽²⁾ And there is the following from John Udall, the eminent Puritan scholar and martyr- "--- the controversie is ---- about no less matter than this, whether Jesus Christ shalbe king or no--- (3). A fuller expression of views along this line was given by one, Master Edward Diringe, when, in 1578, he was being examined and questioned by the opposing authorities. He was asked- "Whether the Queene of Englande hath both authoritie over the ecclesiasticall atate, and ecclesiasticall matters, as well as over the civill state, or no ?" Diringe in replying showed all the deference to the Queen which he could. As he

(1) Calvin. Inst. Bk.IV. Chap.VI.9.

(2) Fenner. "A Defence &c." p.38.

(3) Udall. "A Demonstration"(1588). p.11.

LL. Historical Survey.

stood before his judges, he knew that he was in danger of being condemned to a health-destroying imprisonment, if not to death. But he had his fixed convictions, and they came out bravely in these sentences- "I do beleeeve the catholike Church: for Christ, and not the Christian Magistrate is the life of it. Agayne, in the common wealth the Prince maketh or repealeth lawes, as she thinketh the safetie of her estate and benefite of her people do most require. But in the church, there is no lawe giver but Christe Jesus; Jas.iv.12."(1). There can be no doubt that the Reformed Churchmen of Elizabeth's reign held by, and strove to direct their actions according to the doctrine of the Headship of Christ in the Church. And there is ample evidence that the doctrine was held by the same line of churchmen during the reign of Elizabeth's two successors, and later. It comes out in the Westminster Confession of Faith- "The Catholick or Universal Church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under ~~the~~ Christ the head thereof ---" "The visible church, which is also catholick or universal under the Gospel ---- is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ----" "There is no head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ."(2).

With regard to Scotland, it is well known how strongly this doctrine was held by the leaders of the Reformed Church. It is affirmed in the Confession of Faith of 1560- "As we

(1) "A Parte of a Register". p.79.

(2) Westr. Conf. XXIV. 1.2.6.

II. Historical Survey.

believe in one God, Father, Sone, and Holy Ghost, so do we most earnestlie beleave that from the begynning thair hes bein, now is, and to the end of the world shalbe a Church: that is to say, a company and multitude of men chosin of God, who ryghtlie worship and embrace him by trew fayth in Christ Jesus, who is the onlie head of the same Kirk --".(1). Quite clearly also is the matter stated in the Second Book of Discipline-- "The Power and Policie Ecclesiasticall, is different and distinct in the awin Nature ----- For this power ecclesiasticall flows immediateli from God, and the Mediator Jesus Christ, and is spirituell, not having a temporal heid on Earth, bot onlie Christ, the onlie spirituell King and Governour of his Kirk."(2). It was on the ground of this doctrine that all the Reformed Churchmen in Scotland from Knox onwards maintained their ^{disputes} ~~dispute~~ with the powers against them. We have an instance in that well known story of the discussion between James VI and Andrew Melville at Falkland Palace in 1596, when the latter, apparently with some excitement and with a high pride in the freedom of the Church, among other things said- "And thairfor, Sir, as divers tymes befor, sa now again, I mon tell yow, thair is twa Kings and twa Kingdomes in Scotland, Thair is Chryst Jesus the King, and his kingdome the Kirk, whase subject King James the Saxt is, and of whase kingdome nocht a king, nor a lord, nor a heid, bot a member."(3). And John Welsh, a prisoner along with others because of his

(1) Laing's Knox. Vol.II. p.108. Dunlop. Vol.II. p.59.

(2) Second Bk. Discipline. Chap.I.4.5. Dunlop. Vol.II. p.761.

(3) Melville's Diary. p.370.

II. Historical Survey.

faithfulness to the rights of the Church in connection with the Assembly of Aberdeen, which the king had banned, at his trial firmly declined the authority of the judges to deal with his case, on the ground of this doctrine. He goes on-- "So that howsoever many men think it to be but an indifferent matter, yet it is not so in our consciences, but contrariwise a maine and essentiall point of Christ's kingdome; it being one of his royall prerogatives to be supreme judge in all ecclesiasticall and spirituall affairs, which are matters belonging to his kingdome, the outward administration whereof he exerciseth in and by his Church only---"(1). It was under the authority of this doctrine that the Glasgow Assembly of 1638 met and began its deliberations. In the "Protestation" we read these words-- "Wee Commissioners ----- indicted by his Majestie, and gathered in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ, the only Head, and monarch of his own Church."(2). The doctrine showed its power over the leaders of the Church in varying ways according to circumstances. It moved them to stand for the freedom of the Church. We can find an example of this even in Cromwell's time. General Monk had issued notices to the Sheriffs of each county to make proclamation in every parish of a fast, 28th. Septr., 1654. The two leading men of the Church, Dickson and Douglas, replied, saying among other things-- "It hath been the constant privillidge of this Kirke, and a part of that great interest of Christ's kingdome,

(1) Forbes. "Certaine Records". p.486.

(2) Peterkin. Vol.I. p.119.

II. Historical Survey.

which the godly in this land have been at all times so careful to assert and preserve inviolable, that humiliations and fasts have not been kept but by the appointment of, and for the causes agreed upon by our Kirke Judicatures."(1). One fears there may have been as much mere stubbornness in ^{of these men} the attitude at this time as real principle. But there it is, the assertion of the freedom of the Church, and that freedom made to depend on the Headship of Christ. It was out of loyalty to this doctrine that the Covenanters struggled on and suffered during the cruel times of Charles II and James VII & II.

This doctrine may indeed be ~~called~~ looked upon as creating a historic ruling principle in the Reformed Churches. To its effect upon the very nature and character of the Ministry we shall return later. Here we only notice the subject. With unworthy, hypocritical ministers, the doctrine would doubtless be used as a pretext for resisting right authority, for proceeding in unlawfulness and licence. But when it was held and acted upon by worthy men, it became a great spiritual moulding principle. If the claim of the headship of the Pope enters into the very being and character of the Roman priesthood, as it does, so that every priest becomes essentially connected with the Pope and is a Pope's man, much more ^{must the fact of} ~~will~~ the Headship of Christ enter into the being and character of the Reformed Ministry. Considering its importance, it will be well to look at a leading historic statement of the doctrine as clearly

(1) Firth. "Scotland and the Protectorate". p.332.

II. Historical Survey.

given in the Second Helvetic Confession, a Confession accepted practically by all the Reformed Churches. This is the expressive language of a French Version- "Ainsi, l'Eglise ne peut point avoir d'autre Chef que Jésus Christ. Car comme l'Eglise est un corps spirituel, ainsi il faut qu'elle ait un chef qui lui convienne, et par conséquent spirituel. Elle ne peut pas non plus être conduite ou animée un autre esprit que celui de Jésus-Christ. Saint Paul dit aussi parlant de Jésus Christ - Il est le Chef du Corps de l'Eglise---". (1).

(1) Ruchat. Vol.Vii. p.196. Second Helvetic. Chap. XVII.6.
Latin Version. Niemeyer. p.501.

III. The Ordinary Duties of the Reformed Ministerial Order.

When enquiring into the Doctrine of Orders in the Reformed Churches, we can obtain a very considerable insight into them by examining the ordinary work and activities believed properly to belong to the ministry, and the ideals which were held up and striven after for the fulfilling of the pastoral office.

It is not at all a strange type of ministry we are considering. In the Reformed Churches of the present day, it and its duties continue much the same. If there be any differences they will chiefly be in the ^{different} emphasis placed on certain duties then and now. And perhaps some duties have been added for the minister of these times, while he may have been relieved of some which were then imposed on ~~him~~ ministers. Yet the duties of the ministry are in the main the same today as in those centuries gone by.

The people, however, in the times when the Reformed Ministry was first being instituted, were not familiar with a Ministerial Order of that kind. The style of those in the Mediaeval priesthood and the duties laid upon them were considerably different. The chief work of parish priests, and for all in the priesthood, even for monks and friars in priestly orders, was the offering of a sacrifice for the living and the dead, which it was taught they did in the celebrations of the Mass. Around this duty their other duties more or less revolved. Of course they had to engage in various other duties in their parishes, and the conscientious parish priests would attend

III. Ordinary Duties.

to them as well as they could. Aquinas enunciates the doctrines regarding the duties of Orders- "Because many things are directed (related) to the Eucharist as being the ~~most~~ most exalted of the sacraments, it follows not unfittingly that one Order (e.g. the priesthood) has many acts besides its principal act, and all the more as it ranks higher, since a power extends to the more things, the higher it is."(1). Of course where parishes were belonging to monasteries, as they very ⁽²⁾ numerous were, and if members of the monastic community were assigned to perform the duties in connection with parish churches, as might often be the case, if the churches were neighbouring to the monasteries owning them, owing to the offices which had to be performed in the conventual establishment, a monk would not be as free to engage in parish work as a "secular" parish ^S_A priest would. Dr. Cutts considers that monks did not make good parish priests-"A short experience showed that the monks told off to take charge of these appropriate parishes did not generally make very efficient parish priests- how indeed should they ? The pastoral work of a parish requires other qualities, ideas, sympathies, than those which are proper to the cloister."(3). A considerable proportion of those in the priesthood would have no parochial duties at all; those in monasteries who only had monastic duties, and those Mass priests who did little else than

(1) Aquinas- "The Sacrament of Order". Q. XXXVII.4.

(2) Dowden-"Mediaeval Church in Scotland. p.114.

(3) Cutts- "Parish Priests and their People". p.97.

III. Ordinary Duties.

perform Masses for the living and the dead, chiefly for the dead.

The Reformed Order of the Ministry was much different from the Mediaeval Priesthood, with which the people had hitherto been familiar. First and foremost it certainly was not a sacrificing priesthood, according to what is generally understood by that. The Reformed ministers belonged to the priesthood of all believers, and that was not a sacrificing priesthood. What was the accepted doctrine is clearly stated in the Second Helvetic Confession- "Ipse enim Dominus noster, non ordinavit ullos in ecclesia novi testamenti sacerdotes, qui accepta potestate a Suffraganis, offerant quotidie hostiam, ipsam inquam carnem et ipsum sanguinem Domini pro vivis et mortuis, sed qui doceant et sacramenta administrent."(1). One can just notice in passing that the name "sacerdos" was not immediately dropped. In a baptismal service printed in Zürich in 1523 the minister is called a priest; in one of 1525, a "diener".(2). In the First Helvetic Confession, 1536, the word "sacerdos" is used.(3). ~~But the priestly office had been renounced~~ In Northumberland even at the present day, ministers are sometimes called "priests." But the priestly office had been renounced, and that was sufficient to make a radical difference between ^{Mediaeval} clergy and Reformed ministers, and it would have its effect on all the duties they had to perform.

(1) Niemeyer. p.508.

(2) Daniel. pp. 111,112.

(3) Niemeyer. p.119.

III. Ordinary Duties.

That keen and bitter controversy which was carried on in England during the reign of Elizabeth regarding the wearing of vestments had to do with the renunciation of the doctrines of a priestly office for the clergy. The strict Reformers thought that not even the priestly vestments should be worn by officiating ministers. It was not such an indifferent matter as some thought then and have thought since. There was danger with the use of the vestments that the idea of the priestly office would be brought back. And besides the wearing of such garments was unsuitable and misleading. They were looked on as "defiled with infinite superstition".(1) In reply to the English bishop, Morne, in a letter Bullinger gives his opinion on the matter in dispute-"I do not approve of the linen surplice, as they call it, in the ministry of the Gospel, inas much as those robes copied from Judaism, savour of popery, and are introduced and established with injury to Christian liberty. If it had seemed a thing of so great importance to the Apostles, that the ministers should be distinguished from the general body of the Christians, why did they not retain the ephod according to the Lord's institution? I wish however that the habit in which the minister performs divine service, should be decent, according to the fashion of the country, and have nothing light or fantastic about it."(2). Very probably in England, but for Elizabeth, the priestly vestments would have been discarded. She insisted on the

(1) "Troubles at Frankfort". A Letter from Beza and Others. p.342. Cf. "Puritan Manifestoes." pp.35,36.

III. Ordinary Duties.

wearing of them. In the Marprelate Tracts they are spoken of as "Queen Elizabeth's livery." In other Churches of the Reformation priestly vestments were discarded by the Ministry. The dress of officiating ministers became distinctive, but it was not priestly. A biographer of Zwingli with reference to Zürich says- "The ministers wore their ordinary dress in the pulpit, but this dress characterised by a black cloak and white ruff, was worn by others only on gala occasions, and when it passed out of (general) fashion, it became the distinctive ministerial dress." (1) A biographer of Bullinger describes his custom in dress, and among other things says- "Wie fern von allem eiteln Prunk und Amtsnimbus er gewesen, kann daraus ersehen werden, dass er in seiner burgerlichen kleidung auch die Kanzel bestieg---" (2). It is well known that the black gown became the dress of the Reformed minister when conducting a service. Thus even in outward appearance, by reason of changes in dress, the ministry of the new order was different from the Mediaeval priesthood.

There were other differences . One can notice this one first. It had become only too common in the Mediaeval Church for incumbents of parishes to be non-resident in their parishes. This is not to be wondered at when it was not uncommon for bishops to be non-resident in their dioceses. For the Reformed Ministry it was strictly laid down that ministers must live in their parishes. The Reformed Churches had to enforce this among those in their ministry. There were men inclined to absent themselves from the districts where their churches were. So we

(1) Jackson- pp. 290,291. (2) Zimmermann- p.43.

III. Ordinary Duties.

find the French Church, which was a model to other churches in the way of organizing, in more than one of its Synods passed decrees against absenteeism. Here is one which was passed at the Synod at Charenton, 1623- "On that Canon commanding Pastors to reside in their churches- This Assembly decreed, that after the Twelfth Canon in the First Chapter of our Church Discipline, there shall be this immediately inserted- All ministers shall actually reside in their churches, on pain of being deposed from their Ministerial Office."(1). It will be remembered that these French Synods were the General or National Assemblies of the Church. In the later and more complete form of the Church Discipline, the Canon runs- "Ministers with their families are to be in actual residence at their churches, on pain of being deposed from their charge."(2). The same principles were strongly held in England. John Udall in his "Demonstration" urges the same, and refers to the great Cartwright in support- "Every church-officer (Minister) ought to execute the office committed ~~to him~~ unto him with all faithfull diligence, and consequently to be continually resident upon his charge, T.C. Booke I.p.65.⁽³⁾" And to look at the same move against absenteeism in the early stages of the Reformed Church in Scotland, it was ordered at the June Assembly, 1563- "Forsameikle as ministers, exhorters, reidars, remains not at the Kirks wher ther charges lyes, but dwells in towns farre distant from the saids kirks, wherethrow

(1) Synodicon, p68 Vol.II. p.83.

(2) Campbell- Discipline. Cap.I.14.

(3) "A Parte of a Register." p.26.

III. Ordinary Duties.

the peiple wants the continuall comfort whilk ther daylie presence once sould give be mutuall conference of the minister with the flocke; heirfor the kirk ordaines the ministers, exhorters, and reidars, having mansses to dwell in, that they make residence at the same, visite the sick as they may, and where the parochin is great, that the minister crave the support at the elders and deacons, to help him in the said visitatione."(1). Absenteeism, by reason of the strict regulations against it, seems to have become hardly known in the Reformed Churches.

Further, in accord with the practices and ideals of the Reformed Ministry, there was the determination to do all that was possible to prevent a custom which was allied to absenteeism, and indæed was one of the causes of it. That was the custom of "pluralities", which was the practice of one clergyman having several benefices, often of incumbencies in different parts of the country. It was the case that in Scotland in the early years of the Reformed Church, it was necessary in a number of districts to set one minister, because of the scarcity of ministers, over two or more parishes, but these were always adjacent parishes, and it was possible for one minister to take pastoral charge of what had become, for the time being at any rate, as one parish. This was, and is, wherever arranged, as we still have it today, a very different thing from "pluralities". Moreover in the Reformation period it was largely a temporary

(1) "Universall Kirk". Vol.I. p.48.

III. Ordinary Duties.

arrangement in Scotland. In the case of "pluralities", the parishes, of which one ^{man} had gained the livings, were often far apart, and it was impossible for this one man to minister to the several parishes. It was a great evil in the Church. For expressions of opposition to it one may notice the words of ~~two~~ English Reformed Churchmen of different periods. In the "Directory of Church Government" of 1574 drawn up by Travers and Cartwright, is this regulation- "Albeit it be lawfull for a Minister upon just occasion to Preach in another Church then that whereof he is Minister, yet none may exercise any ordinary Ministry elsewhere, but for a certaine time upon great occasion, and by the consent of his Church and Conference (Presbytery)⁽¹⁾". Richard Baxter, in the "Reformed Pastor", 1655, having the ordinary minister in mind and also diocesan bishops, says, - "When we are commanded to take heed to all the flock, it is plainly implied, that flocks must ordinarily be no greater than we are capable of overseeing, or "taking heed to". God will not lay upon us natural impossibilities ----- If the pastoral office consists in overseeing all the flock, then surely the number of souls under the care of each pastor must not be greater than he is able to take such heed to as is here required."⁽²⁾ These words are applicable to cases where there are too large parishes as well as to "pluralities", but we can gather ^{from them} what Baxter's opinions against the latter would be, ~~from them~~.

There was another hindrance in the right discharge of the Ministerial Office which the Reformed Churches set themselves

(1) Briggs. Appendix I. p.v.

(2) Baxter. "Reformed Pastor". p.69.

III. Ordinary Duties.

to oppose, and that was the following of other occupations by those who were in the ministry. In the Papal Church it is not difficult to find eminent examples of clergy having important state positions in addition to their office in the Church. Cardinal Wolsey was Chancellor of England; Cardinal Beaton was Chancellor of Scotland; and later in France, Cardinal Richelieu and Cardinal Mazarin, both occupied chief positions in the State. Examples of those in lower ranks ~~who~~ who engaged in other occupations are the monks who worked at building, farming, brewing, or wine-making. Not only did the Reformed Churches disallow their ministers having other trades and professions, but also having state appointments..In the French Church, the Synod of Rochelle, 1571, enacted- "Ministers shall be forbidden to practice physick, or any other calling, trade or vocation whatsoever."(1). In England, Cartwright wrote against ministers having other occupations.(2). In Scotland, when in 1573 the Regent Morton desired the Assembly to appoint ministers to the College of Justice, the Assembly would not agree, making an exception in the case of Robert Pont only because he already held such an appointment. And at more than one Assembly, over the proposals to have some ministers in the Parliament, there was strong objection raised. It was judged to be "repugnant" to the Word of God, and many texts in support of this contention were cited.(3). There was not to be any occupation engaged in by Reformed ministers but that of

(1) Synodicon. Vol.I. p.95. *and while canons to the like effect can be quoted from Rome, they were largely disregarded.*

(2) Whitgift. p.429.

(3) Universall Kirk. p.988 et seq.; pp.1010-1023.

III. Ordinary Duties.

the Ministry, and nothing that would even lessen the time to be spent in its proper duties. The ministry was too important a calling to be turned aside from to follow other interests or to be subject to outside distractions. Before ever the Rēfēb Reformed Church had been set up in Scotland teaching to that effect had been given, as we see in the Treatise on Justification by Balnaves, 1548,- "If thou be called to the office of a Bishop or Minister of the Word of God----- Thou shalt not meddle thee with secular affaires or busines, for what is not thy vocation----- The principall work yee should do is to preach and teach--"(1).

The most important work of the Reformed Minister had to be preaching. There was no true Ministry without it. If a man, who was supposed to be in some ministerial order did not preach, he was not a minister of the true Church. This was one of the chief indictments against the Mediaeval bishops and clergy, that they did not preach. Preaching had also been assigned a very important position in the Ministry of the Lutheran Churches. Luther at the very beginning gives it this position. So he has it in his "Address to the Nobility", June 1520, speaking of the appointing of a minister in every town- "We should have as assistants several priests and deacons, married or not as they pleased, who should help him to govern the people and congregation with sermons and the ministration of the sacraments."(2). All were to be preachers. Still more

---(1) Laing's Knox. Vol.III. p.531.

(2) Wace & Buchheim. p.207.

III. Ordinary Duties.

definitely Luther speaks in the "Babylonian Captivity",-Octr., 1520-"From ~~this~~ this it follows that he who does not preach the word, being called to this very office by the Church, is in no way a priest, and that the Sacrament of Orders can be nothing else than a ceremony for choosing preachers in the Church." (1) This also is significant. In Luther's "Ordinations-Ordnungen", 1537, there is the heading- "Formula ordinandorum ministrorum Verbi". The very description of the office is "Ministers of the Word". Again we can notice preach^hing and the sacraments are to take the place of the Mass in the duties of the ~~Minist~~ Minister. In the early days of the Reformation in Germany the Agenda Marchica gives directions in the ceremony of ordination as follows- "Man soll auch die Misbreuch unterlassen, als furnemlich da gesagt wird- Accipe potestatem offerendi sacrificium pro vivis et defunctis- Das dem haubtartickel unserer Christlichen Religion entgegen; An des stad sol inen befohlen werden- Das heilig Evangelium zusprechen, und die hochw^urdigen Sacramente nach Christi einsetzung zureichen und anzutreiben." (1) The following also is typical of the prominence accorded to the work of preaching in the Lutheran Ministry. It is given in- "Die Mark Brandenburg Visitations-Abschied fur Frankfurt von 1600", and the words are those spoken along with the laying on of hands- "So nehmen wir dich an zu einem diener Christi und prediger seines heiligen evangelii und geben dir mit auflegung unser hande nach dem apostolischen und ersten kirchengebrauch vollkomene macht und gewalt, gottes wort offentlich, lauter

(1) Daniel. Vol.II. p.524.

III. Ordinary Duties.

und rein, ohne und ausserhalb menschlicher satzungen irrthum und ketzereien, fleissig und treulich zu predigen". (1)

The Reformed Churches laid quite as much stress on preaching as the Lutheran. Perhaps in regarding it as a regulative principle for the very nature of the Ministry, they carried the implications of the importance of preaching still further. Zwingli, the pioneer of the Reformed Church, in his Sixty-seven Articles quite bluntly states and without any reservations- the words are given in the old Swiss-German- "Sy erkennet ouch kein priester, denn die das gotswort verkundend".(2). ~~This was what the doctrine of the Reformed Ministerial Order was setting off with,~~ ^{set out from this,} that preaching is an essential element of the true ministry. It is the view which is declared in the Confessions of Faith. So it is in the First Helvetic of 1536- "The chief gift of this office is to preach penitence and remission of sins through ~~Christ~~ Christ."(3). The Genevan Confession of 1537 says-"Nous ne reputons points a autres pasteurs de l'Eglise que les fideles ministres de la Parole de Dieu."(4). In the Geneva "Ordonnances" of 1541 in section 3 are the words, referring to ministers- "leur office est d'annoncer la Parole de Dieu."(5). The same words are put in the "Ordonnances" of 1576. And ministers-elect had solemnly

(1) Sehling. Vol.III. p.215.

(2) Rohler-"Das Buch der Reformation Muldrych Zwinglis."
Niemeyer. p.12; Latin Version. p.13.

(3) Schaff-Creeds. First Helvetic. Sec. XIX. Niemeyer.p.119.

(4) Meyer. p.262.259.

(5) Meyer. p.262.

III. Ordinary Duties.

to promise before the City Council that they would declare purely the Word of God.(1). In the Scots Confession of 1560, Article XXII, are the strong words-"---lauchfull ministeris, whome we affirme to be onlie thei that ar appointed to the preiching of the worde, or into whose mouthis God hes putt some sermoun of exhortatioun."(2). The Second Helvetic Confession, 1566, has as Article 18- "Officia ministrorum sunt varia, quae tamen plerique ad duo restringunt, in quibus omnia alia comprehenduntur ad doctrinam Christi Evangelicam, et ad legitimam sacramentorum administrationem."(3).

That preaching is the chief essential of the Ministerial Office passed into the common thought of the Reformed Churches. An early expression of this persuasion is found in the Treatise on Justification by Balnaves, which we have already quoted from. These are the words- "If thou bee called to the office of a Bishop or Minister of the Word of God, preach the pure and syncere worde to the flocke committed to thy charge."(4). Balnaves does not think of the Bishop-Minister except as a Preacher of the Word. The same is to be noticed among the Puritans in England. When the "Admonition" was sent to Parliament in 1571, very plainly the essential Ministry was witnessed to-"By the word of God it (the Ministry) is an offyce of preaching; they (the Prelatists) make it an offyce of reading; Christe said, goe preache, they in mockerie give them the Bible, and authoritie

(1) Meyer. pp. 275, 280.

(2) Laing's Knox. Vol.II. p.115.

(3) Niemeyer. p.510. Schaff- Creeds, Second Helvetic.

(4) Laing's Knox. Vol.III. p.532.

III. Ordinary Duties.

to preache, and yet suffer them not, except that they have newe licences. So that they make the cheefest part, preeching, but an accessorie, that is as a thing without which their offyce may and doth consist. In the Scriptures there is attributed unto ~~them~~ the ministers of God, the knowledge of the heavenly misteries, and therefore as the greatest token of their love, they are enjoined to fede Gods Lambes, and yet with these (the Prelatists) suche are admitted and accepted, as onely are bare readers that are able to say service, and minister a sacrament."(1).

In this connection, however, we must particularly emphasise that it is the preaching of the Word of God which is the constitutig essential of the Reformed Ministry. Before the Reformation there had been preaching; in some periods very little of it, ~~in other~~ in other periods rather more. On the whole in the Mediaeval Church preaching was not a strong feature. The friars, especially in the early enthusiasms of their orders, went about preaching. Otherwise there was much neglect of it. The ceremonial nature of the services of the churches did not favour it. And the gross ignorance of the clergy made any preaching almost impossible, an ignorance which seemed to deepen as the centuries passed by. Church authorities at times ~~it~~ issued orders for preaching to be undertaken. The rulers of the English Church time and again enjoined the clergy to engage in preaching and the teaching of the people in the things of the Catholic Faith. They were to

(1) "Puritan Manifestoes". p.22.

III. Ordinary Duties.

preach on the Articles of the Faith, the Ten Commandments, the the Seven Principal Virtues, Seven Works of Mercy, the Seven Deadly Sins, [^]The Seven Sacraments, (1). It is questionable whether the greater part of the clergy could ever carry out such injunctions because of their ignorance. Where preaching was attempted, at its best it may have been as Dr. Fisher describes- "In the preaching of the Middle Ages there abounded appeals to fear. The aim was to paint the torments of the lost in the most vivid colours. The sufferings of Jesus and the sorrow of the Virgin Mother were favourite themes, in the unfolding of which the preacher exerted himself to excite the emotions of his auditors." (2) The less worthy kind would be as Dr. Cunningham describes- "The discourses of these monkish orators, we may well believe, were not such as would now be applauded: they embodied not the Christianity that now is, but the Christianity that then was received in the churches. They were generally filled with legends of fabulous saints, the pains of purgatory, and the virtues of the Mass." (3) We know, too, how the sellers of indulgences preached in the days preceding the Reformation, declaring the efficacy of what they were selling. We have to say that during the Middle Ages there was comparatively little preaching, and what there was could for the most part hardly be described as the preaching of the Word of God. How could there be the preaching of the Word when there was commonly such deep ignorance of ordinary Christian knowledge ? This ignorance seems

(1) Cutts-"Parish Priests and their People." Chap. XIV.

(2) Fisher-"History of the Christian Church." p.238.

(3) Cunningham. Vol. I. p.197.

III. Ordinary Duties.

to have been great before the Reformation. Many ^{examples} ~~examples~~ of it could be quoted.(1). Even where there was some education, there was the great lack of the enlightenment of the Scriptures. Luther said in the "Address to the Nobility"- "A spinner or a seamstress teaches her daughter her trade while she is young, but now even the most learned prelates and bishops do not know the Gospel."(2) There is the well-known story of the Bishop of Dunkeld, who said, when having before him for trial one of his reforming clergy- "I thank God I have lived well these many years and never knew either the Old or New (Testaments). I content me with my Portuise" (Breviary).(3). Where there was such ignorance of the sources of Christian knowledge, there could not be at the best what might be called ^{the preaching of} the Word of God. It ~~was~~ not that kind of preaching which was the constituting essential of the Reformed Ministry.

Nor was it of the kind which it is possible to hear in our times. As an extreme case one may mention that ~~perhaps~~ there ~~can~~ ^{may} be found ~~a~~ preachers of the Reformed Church in ~~the~~ present day who will discourse on a doctrinal subject and quote no verse of Scripture, nor mention the name of Christ, and hardly mention the name of God, but will instead substitute ^{their} ~~his~~ own not very pious ruminations on the subject in hand, ~~That will be a very extreme case if found. We are, however, acquainted with a kind of preaching which is largely the expression of the preacher's personal peculiar meditations and~~

(1) Cf. Coulton-"Life in the Middle Ages". Vol.II. 21,22.

Spottiswoode's Mistory. Vol.I. p.132.

Cunningham. Vol.I. pp. 231-233.

(2) Wace & Buchheim. pp.233,234. (3) Spottiswoode. p.149.

III. Ordinary Duties.

~~fancies, in which there appears to be~~ ^{making} little effort to bring the matter set ^{forth} _^ into line with the holy and living Word of God. That was not the kind of preaching which the Reformed Confessions and Church Leaders declared to be the essential constituting element of the Reformed Ministerial Order. One makes these comparisons in ^r _^ order to bring out more clearly what exactly this doctrine of a preaching ministry implies.

The ideal in the doctrine was the preaching of the Word of God, which was to be a high and solemn effort, with all due sense of the responsibility which rested upon the preacher, and having its sources and authority ⁱⁿ _^ the revealed Holy Word of God as found in the Scriptures. Unless we understand what the Reformed Churchmen meant by, the preaching of the Word, we shall not understand the ~~Ré~~ nature of the Reformed Ministry, nor all that was claimed for it and its preaching.

Let us just notice some of the declarations and writings which describe this preaching and the function of the preachers for these two centuries which we have under consideration. The First Helvetic Confession proclaims the high nature of this preaching office of the Ministry-"Ministers of the Church are workers with God, through whom He distributes and presents knowledge of Himself, and remission of sins, converts men to Himself, lifts up, consoles, terrifies, and judges men. Yet we ascribe all working and power in all to God alone."(1) And high ground indeed is taken up for the office of preaching by the Genevan Confession of 1537, which we have already quoted

(1) Schaff- Creeds. First Helvetic. Sect. XV (XVI).
Niemeyer. p.119.

III. Ordinary Duties.

from-"~~Ministres~~ Ministre de la Parole de Dieu, et repaissant les brebis de Jésus Christ par icelle en instructions, admonitions, consolations, exhortations, répréhensions, d'autre part résistant à toutes fausses doctrines et tromperies du diable sans mêler parmi la pure doctrines des Ecritures, leurs songes, ni folles imaginations. Et ne leur attribuons autre puissance, ni autorité, sinon de conduire, régir et gouverner le peuple de Dieu à eux commis par icelle Parole, en laquelle ils ont puissance de commander, défendre, promettre et menacer, et sans laquelle ils ne peuvent et ne doivent rien attenter. Or comme nous recevons les vrais ministres de la Parole de Dieu comme messagers et ambassadeurs de Dieu, lequel il faut écouter comme lui-même, et réputons leur ministre être une commission de Dieu nécessaire en l'Eglise."(1) That is a very strong statement, that the preachers were to be heard received as the messengers of God, and to be heard as if it were God speaking.

This high conviction regarding the preaching which had to belong to the Ministry goes on into the later times of our period. Noble expression of it is presented in the documents of the Westminster Assembly, 1643-1649. We notice what is given in the Larger Catechism, Quest. 159.--"They that are called to labour in the Ministry of the Word, are to preach sound doctrine, diligently, in season and out of season; plainly, not in enticing words of ~~man's~~ man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit, and of power; faithfully making known

(1) Meyer. p.259. Latin Version, Kidd. p.571.

III. Ordinary Duties.

the whole counsel of God; wisely applying themselves to the necessities and capacities of the hearers; zealously, and with fervent love to God and the souls of His people; sincerely aiming at His glory, and their conversion, edification, and salvation." And in the Directory for the Public Worship of God there is an admirable section which deals with the preaching of the Word. It begins- "Preaching of the Word, being the power of God unto salvation, and one of the greatest and most excellent works belonging to the ministry of the Gospel, should be so performed, that the workman need not be ashamed, and may save himself and those that hear him." The whole of this section in the "Directory" would be well worth while reading over and over again by preachers . It sets forth the necessity of every care being given to the matter of preaching, and impresses one with the feeling that in the performance of this essential duty of preaching the Ministry can become a high calling. Another important pronouncement comes from the London Provincial Assembly of 1654, one of the most ~~auth~~ authoritative ^{for England} after those of the Westminster Assembly- "By the preaching of the Word we understand an authoritative explication and application of Scripture, for exhortation, edification, and comfort, to a congregation met together for the solemn worship of God, in the stead and place of Christ; and we desire that every branch of this description may be well weighed in the balance of the Sanctuary. The Subject of the preaching is the Word of God, Mat. 28.19.----- This work is the explication and application of this word.-----The end of this work is the edification, and comfort of the church---- The object of this

III. Ordinary Duties.

work is a Congregation met together for the solemn worship of God-----The manner of the doing of this work is authoritatively -----in the stead of Christ -----He that heareth you, heareth Me." (1)

Perhaps it will be somewhat of a descent, after noticing these high doctrines regarding the preaching Ministry, to look at some other indications of the high value set on preaching in the Reformed Churches. These other facts, however, can all make their contribution to the subject, and have their own interest. Some matters regarding the pulpit may be referred to first. In the Reformed Churches (i.e. the buildings) the pulpit ^{has} ~~has~~ become the central feature of the building. One does not need to conclude that that means its actual position is always central. In the pre-Reformation churches, when they were taken over for the Reformed worship, the pulpit might often be left in its original position, either on one side of the nave, or at the corner of the chancel and one of the ~~trans~~ transepts. And new churches have been built with corner pulpits, though the usual plan has been to set the pulpit actually in a central position in the building. But in all cases, in the true Reformed Church building, it is central in interest. It is not a high altar, nor altars in side chapels, nor even a Communion Table, but the pulpit which is the central feature of the building. With regard to the ^{conviction} ~~feeling~~ that the pulpit was the most important feature we can find some interesting ^{confirmatory evidence.} ~~items, which reveal~~ that. A discussion arose in the Westminster

(1) "Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici". pp.77,78.

III. Ordinary Duties.

Assembly on the right place for the baptismal font in the church. The old position had been near the church door, to symbolize, it ~~has~~ ^{has} been said, that entrance to the Christian Church is by way of baptism. "It was resolved, it should be in what place the people may best see and hear. The Scots urged hard to have it at the pulpit. There fell in a debate about fonts: some called to have them demolished: but this was cried against: only the Scots desired that the place of it might be altered; viz. removed from the church door. At last a vote passed that the superstitious place of the font should be altered."(1).

Not only was it considered most suitable by some to have baptisms near the pulpit, there were those who directed that ordinations should take place beside it. The candidate for ordination in the French Church, at the time when the hands were to be laid on his head was to kneel before the ordainer at the foot of the pulpit.(2). And still more noteworthy was it, when it was ordained that the communion tables should be near the pulpit, as in the Genevan "Ordonnances" of 1576-
"Que les tables soient près des chaires des temples, afin que les ministres se puissent rendre plus commodément près ^{des} dites tables après la prédication et prières accoutumées, pour administrer la sainte Cène."(3).

One need not wonder at this prominence given to the pulpit. It was consistent with the doctrines concerning the

(1) Lightfoot- p.315

(2) Campbell- p.3. Synodicon. Vol.I. p.314.

(3) Meyer- p.6 p.287, "Ordonnances" XLIV.

III. Ordinary Duties.

preaching of the Ministry. The altar in the Mediaeval church was that from which the real flesh of Christ was supposed to be served to be partaken of by communicants. The Communion Table of the Reformed church was that at which were dispensed the symbols of the broken body of Christ Who had become the Word made flesh, that those receiving in faith might have their souls fed by Christ "the Bread of Life". From the pulpit there was distributed ^{the} "Bread of Life" through the Word preached. Preaching was almost a sacramental act, and greater than the sacramental symbols. For not by mere symbol, that is, indirectly, but directly and in reality the hearers were made partakers of the actual, not symbolic, "Bread of Life." It was the Living Word they were receiving without which the soul cannot live. They were made partakers, not of the Word becoming flesh, as one might infer will be the supposition from the ^{Roman Church} doctrine of the ~~Papal~~ Eucharist, but of the flesh, that is the human life of Jesus, and the divine spirit of Jesus, becoming the Word of the Gospel of Grace in Christ, which becomes "Christ in you the hope of glory."

Further, in noticing what indicates the importance ~~with~~ given to preaching in the Reformed Churches, one can refer to the large place given to it in Public Worship. One of the objections which Cartwright had against the English Book of Common Prayer was that it left in its order of service so little to preaching. "Another fault there is in the whole service or liturgy of England, for that it maintaineth an unpreaching ministry; and so consequently an unlawful ministry;

III. Ordinary Duties.

I say it maintaineth, not so much in that it appointeth a number of psalms and other prayers and chapters to be read, which may occupy the time that is to be spent on preaching, -----
I say not so much in that point, as for that it requireth nothing to be done by the minister ~~which~~ which a child of ten years old cannot do as well and as lawfully as that man where-with the book (the Book of Common Prayer) contenteth itself."(1).
What Cartwright points out is that the Prayer Book makes it possible for a person with no great knowledge to conduct services, and so opens up the ministry to the kind of person who cannot preach. And in passing he also ^op_hints out that the English Liturgy leaves little time during the service for preaching, for it provides so much else. That is the case. The books of prayers for Reformed Church services leave much more room for preaching. It may be mentioned that at the present day, the time spent over the sermon in services of Reformed churches on the Continent is often a much greater proportion of the time of the whole service than is the case in British churches in general. That was the way in the Reformed Churches of the period covered by this thesis, so much so that services were often called by the name of "The Preachings."

Another indication of the importance assigned to the preaching of the Word is the frequency of the preaching services made stated ordinances, at which according to regulation the people were to be present. The following were the arrangements made by the Genevan "Ordonnances" of 1541- "Le dimanche 448

(1) Whitgift- p.454.

III. Ordinary Duties.

qu'il y ait sermon au point du jour à Saint-Pierre et Saint-Gervais et à l'heure accoutumée au dit Saint-Pierre, à la Madeleine et Saint-Gervais. -----

Est jours ouvriers, outre les deux prédications qui se font, que, trois la semaine, on prêche à Saint-Pierre, à savoir lundi, mercredi et vendredi, et que ces sermons soient sonnés l'un après l'autre à telle heure qu'ils puissent être finis devant qu'on commence ailleurs."(1). Similar arrangements were made in other places. They were much the same for the churches of Edinburgh. Of course in country places preaching services could not be as frequent. Calvin himself was an assiduous and frequent preacher in Geneva. The strain on the ministers must have been considerable. The ministers of Geneva found it necessary at one time to ask for some relief. There may have been some strain on the hearers too, though we must not judge their capacity for listening to sermons by our own.

Now far in actual practice the Ministry of the Reformed Churches fulfilled the ideal of the doctrine of the essential preaching ministry, one cannot go into. Probably many of the ministers preached a long way below the ideal of their office. Is it not generally or always so, that men act below the ideals set before them? But ^{the} doctrine put the ideal there. It is perfectly clear how high and important the Reformed Churches and their leaders regarded preaching^{of the Word}, and how essential a part of the Ministerial Office it was made. Preaching did, as

(1) Meyer- pp.265,266.

III. Ordinary Duties.

a Lutheran ordination service suggested(1), take the place of the Mass so far as Reformed Churches were concerned; not as providing another form of offering to God, but in its centrality in public worship, and in the work of the Ministerial Order. As a priest in the Papal Church was one for offering up the sacrifice of the Mass, so a Reformed ^{minister} was one for the dispensing of the Word of God by preaching. So constitutive of the Ministry was this preaching that those in the Ministry were designated commonly by such terms as "Preacher of the Word", "Minister of the Gospel". It was thus that Calvin styled himself in his last Will and Testament, not as a diocesan bishop by the name of his diocese and nothing more, nothing more, nor as Moderator, as he might, but- "Jean Calvin, ministre de la Parole de Dieu en l'Eglise de Genève." (2)

The Reformed Minister had other work and duties besides that of preaching, more of these probably than what the priest of the Papal Church had in addition to his duties at Mass. It is not necessary to do more than refer to these briefly at the present. Some of them will come in for more attention later on. The minister had the administering of the Sacraments. This duty is often stated to be his at the same time as preaching is laid on him. Then he had also to maintain discipline among those committed to his charge. A short passage from Calvin's Institutes names all these duties- "From these and similar passages which everywhere occur (Mt. XVIII. 19, Lk. XXII. 19.,

(1) Daniel. Vol. II. p. 524.

(2) Bonnet. Letres, Vol. II. p. 563.

III. Ordinary Duties.

ICor. IV.1., Tit. I.9.), we may infer that the two principal parts of the office of pastors are to preach the Gospel, and administer the sacraments ----- Our present purpose, ~~however~~ however, is not to enumerate the separate qualities of a good pastor, but only to indicate what those ~~who~~ (profess who call themselves pastors, viz. that in presiding over the Church they have not an indolent dignity, but must ~~teach~~ train the people to true piety by the doctrine of Christ, administer the sacred mysteries, preserve and exercise right discipline."(1). There ~~were also the marriages for the minister to officiate at,~~ ^{Further, the minister officiated at marriages,} and funerals. He had also the catechizing of the children, a most important duty, and so regarded in those days, to be done regularly every Sunday, (2), and which we may think of as being in place of the modern Sunday School. There was also regular visitation to be undertaken throughout the parish. There was also in Geneva, as a regular duty, the visitation of prisoners. (3) And there was every where recognized the important duty of the visitation of the sick. That was a duty of the priests of the mediaeval Church. But the Reformed minister did not visit for the purpose of hearing confessions and granting absolution, and administering extreme unction, as in the case of the priests. Those practices were entirely set aside. The minister was to visit in order to give admonition and comfort, and to pray with the sick. The duty is well set forth in the "Ordonnances" of

(1) Calvin- Inst. Bk. IV. Chap. III. 6. p. 63.

(2) Meyer- p. 265. Cf. Peterkin. pp. 208, 209. There was cate-

(3) Meyer- pp. 272, 290. chising of adults as well as children.

III. Ordinary Duties.

Geneva of both 1541 and 1576. This is from the latter-"Pour ce que plusieurs sont négligents de se consoler en Dieu par sa Parole, quand ils se trouvent en nécessité de maladie, dont adviène que plusieurs meurent sans aucune admonition ou doctrine, laquelle lors est à l'homme plus nécessaire et salutaire que jamais: pour cette cause avons avisé et ordonné que nul ne demeure trois jours entiers, gisant au lit malade, et qu'il ne le fasse savoir au ministre et que chacun s'avise d'appeler les ministres à l'heure opportune quand ils les voudront avoir, afin de ne les distraire de leur charge~~44~~ en laquelle ils servent en commun à toute l'Eglise. Et pour ôter toute excuse, que cela soit recommandé spécialement aux parents, amis et gardes: afin qu'ils n'attendent pas que le malade soit prêt à rendre l'esprit. Car en telle extrémité, les consolations ne servent de guère à la plupart."(1). And at a later time the Westminster Assembly gave great attention to this matter. In the "Directory for Public Worship" very fully it is laid down what the minister is to do in this visiting. This extract will show how well the subject was treated- "Times of sickness and affliction are special opportunities put into his hand (~~there~~ the minister's) by God to minister a word in season to weary souls: because then the consciences of men are or should be more awakened to bethink themselves of their spiritual estate for eternity; and Satan also takes advantage then to load them more ~~44~~ with sore and heavy temptations: therefore the minister, being sent for, and repairing to the sick, is to apply himself, with all tenderness and

(1) Meyer- p.289 sect.IVIII.

III. Ordinary Duties.

love, to administer some spiritual good to his soul, to this effect." &c.&c.(1). In the dangerous days of frequent plagues, the carrying out of this duty by the ministers required courage. But courage was not an element likely to be left out of the doctrines of the Ministry in those days so full of hazard in more ways than one. There are cases which show that Reformed ministers proved themselves to have the courage necessary for the performance^a of this duty. Calvin in a letter to Viret, written from ~~Geneva~~ Geneva in October, 1542, says- "The pestilence also begins to rage here with greater violence, and few who are at all affected by it escape its ravages. One of our colleagues was to be set apart for attendance upon the sick. Because Peter (Peter Blanchet) offered himself, all readily acquiesced. If anything happens to him I fear I must take the risk upon myself, for as you observe, because we are debtors to one another, we must not be wanting to those who, more than any others, stand in need of our ministry."(2). In another letter to Farel, written in September, 1545, he reports- "Here, as you know, we are in great straits: you are away from us ;Matthaeus is occupied in the hospital for those who are suffering from the plague. In the ~~meanwhile~~ meantime, while we are calling upon you to come, we have lost our very excellent brother and most faithful colleague Geniston."(3) The Editor's footnote to the above gives these particulars- "The minister, Louis de Geniston, following the noble example of Pierre Blanchet, cut off by the plague in 1543,

(1) Westr. Dir. p.550

(2) Bonnet- Letters. Vol.I. p.334.

(3) Do. Vol.II. p.9.

III. Ordinary Duties.

had of his own accord, offered himself for the service of the hospital set apart for those afflicted with the plague. He fell under it, a victim of his devotedness, in September 1545. His wife and two of his children were carried off a few days afterwards by the scourge, which almost wholly depopulated several quarters of the city."(1). It is well known, too, that at the time of the Great Plague in London in 1665, when the men who had been put in as clergy of the parish churches of London to replace the Reformed ministers, who had been deprived of their livings by the Act of Uniformity of 1662, fled and left the plague-stricken city, the "outed" Reformed ministers took their places and ministered to the sick and dying at the risk of their own lives. Richard Baxter writes of this in his Autobiography, very simply and sympathetically giving his tribute to the courage and devotion of these men.(2). And not a few of them did perish as they went about their self-sacrificing work. The following extract vividly tells its own tale- "They knew the risk they ran. In St. Giles Cripplegate burial register

you read these names, all entered at the height of the plague-

Aug.27. Samuel Austin, minister, plague.

Sept. 6. John Askew, minister, plague.

: 15. Samuel Skelton, minister, plague.

: 16. Abraham Jennaway (Janeway), minister, plague.

: 28. Henry Marley, minister, plague.

: 30. John Wall, minister, plague. " (3).

As for the spheres in which the ministers ~~were~~ were to fulfil their duties, these were usually parishes or congregations.

(1) Bonnet- Letters. ~~Vol.II~~ Vol.II. p.9.

(2) Autobiography of Richard Baxter. p.196.

(3) W.G.Bell-"The Great Plague in London in 1665." p.149.

III. Ordinary Duties.

Each minister had to keep to his own charge, and feel himself responsible for it, and as has been noticed above, was expected to be resident in his parish or near his church. Calvin deals with this subject in the "Institutes"- "While we assign a church pastor, we deny not that he who is fixed to one church may assist other churches, whether any disturbance ~~may have~~ occurred which requires his presence, or his advice is asked on some doubtful matter. But because that policy is necessary to maintain the peace of the Church, each has his own proper duty assigned, lest all should become disorderly, run up and down without any certain vocation, flock together promiscuously to one spot, and capriciously leave the churches vacant, being more solicitous for their own convenience than for the edification of the church. This arrangement ought as far as possible to be commonly observed, that every one, content with his own limits, may not encroach on another's province. Nor is this a human invention." (1)

Calvin goes on to cite Scripture in support of what he has advanced. In Geneva the city was divided into three parishes; Saint Pierre, La Madeleine, and Saint Gervais, to work in each of which the ministers of the city were assigned. (2). In Basel the work of the ministers was grouped around the Minster, Saint Leonard's and St. Peter's Churches. (3). We give these as examples, and they may show us that the Reformed Ministry was set for orderly ministrations. As the subject is of considerable

(1) Calvin- Inst. Bk. IV, Chap. III. 6.7.

(2) Munter. "The Teaching of Calvin." pp. 203, 204.

(3) Richter. Vol. I. p. 104.

III. Ordinary Duties.

importance, it will be worth while to have a description of work done in parishes. Of such in Geneva, Calvin gives an account in a letter to Olevianus, 1561. "Pour ce qui regarde les adultes, nous faisons tous les ans la visite de chaque famille. Nous partageons entre nous les divers quartiers de la ville, afin qu'on puisse examiner par ordre l'état de chaque dizaine. Le ministre est accompagné d'un ancien du consistoire. Là on examine les nouveau habitants. On n'en use pas ainsi à l'égard de ceux qui ont été reçus une fois; mais on s'informe seulement si la maison est in paix et bien réglée; s'il y a des querelles avec les voisins; s'il y a de l'ivrognerie; s'ils sont paresseux et négligens à fréquenter les sermons."(1).

With regard to ministers keeping to their own caharges, the French Discipline is quite explicit- "Ministers s----- shall belong to the flock entrusted to their care." (I.10) "Ministers are not to be wanderers here and there, nor shall they have liberty to intrude themselves- into a charge- wherever on their own authority they may choose."(I.24.). "The minister of one church may not preach in another without the consent of its minister, unless ---".(I.25.)⁽²⁾

The Westminster Assembly in its time discussed this same matter. The Independents in the Assembly were in favour of "gathered" congregations, that is, congregations composed of people gathered from anywhere, which a minister would have charge of. The Presbyterians, as we say, the Reformed Churchmen

(1) Ruchat. Vol. VI.p.368.

(2) Campbell- pp. 3,6.

III. Ordinary Duties.

were for a territorial ministry, that is, for ministers to be placed to work in parishes. That may indicate to us that they recognized the work of a minister to be, not only for the edification of those who would probably be Christian people, ~~to~~ as they had gathered themselves to a particular church, but also to work among those who had not even enough religious desire to attach themselves to any church, the more or less irreligious people of a particular area.

In those countries where the whole or most of the country turned over to the Reformed Church, as in Scotland, the plan was to place ministers in what were in the main the old pre-Reformation parishes.

Perhaps one cannot do better in concluding this section on the ordinary duties of the Reformed Ministerial Order than quote from the pronouncements of the London Provincial Assembly of 1654, the following, which will give a kind of summary of these duties- "That there is a work belonging to the Ministry is out of question, and what that work is, is confessed by all; It belongs to them to dispense the mysteries of God, the keys of the kingdom of God are in their hands; It is their work to watch for souls as they that must give account of them at the great day; and to preach the Word, by sound doctrine to convince gainsayers, to administer the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, to pray for and bless the people in the Name of God, to rule and govern the Church, having a care of discipline; and all these as in the place and person of Christ."(1)

(1) "Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici". Pt.I. p.76.

IV. The Powers of the Reformed Ministerial Order.

The power which was said to be conferred on those in the Papal priesthood was considerable. They were given power to offer the sacrifice of the Mass for the living and the dead. And they were give the "Power of the Keys" (under the Pope, of course), "Whosoever sins they remitted, were remitted, and whosoever sins they retained, they were retained." The powers in practice of the Mediaeval Papal priest came to be very great, which he could exercise by means of the Confessional and in other ways. There were powers also entrusted to those in the Reformed Ministerial Order. Whether these in practice turned out to be so very great must be left to the judgment of any who ^{may} ~~may~~ consider the matter. The powers really varied at different times and in different places, in practice. We can find them in force in some measure at the present day, even if they have become somewhat lessened and weakened and curtailed, at any rate as regards some of them. In the centuries of the Reformed Ministry which we have under review, these powers were considerable both, in doctrine ^{or theory} and in practice. We will examine them under two heads- I. Spiritual Powers, and II, Administrative Powers. Perhaps we better say here that we are using the word "Spiritual" in a narrow sense. All the powers were really spiritual. But it is a convenient division to narrowly call some spiritual powers and some administrative.

~~First~~. I. The Spiritual Powers. Among the most important of the duties of the Minister is the administering of the Sacraments. We have mentioned that already in the previous chapter. That this was to be one of the duties of the Ministry is stated, one

IV. Powers.

may safely say, in almost all the Confessions or Disciplines. But not only is it a duty assigned to Ministers, but it is also laid down that none other than a minister is to dispense the sacraments. There is special emphasis laid on the rule that Baptism must not be administered except by a minister. The reason of the special emphasis was, not because it was considered that Baptism was a more important sacrament than the Lord's Supper - not by any means - and so the ministerial dispensing of it must be more rigidly adhered to. It was because there had been more laxness over baptism. It had been administered in the Papal Church, as it became also allowable in the English Church, by women as well as men, by others not priests, as it was said "when it was necessary". The Reformers, not believing in Baptismal regeneration, or that a child's salvation depended on Baptism, did not believe that a necessity ever could arise for this sacrament to be dispensed except by a minister. So it was a strict rule in all the Reformed Churches that it, and of course the Lord's Supper, must be dispensed by a minister. In the Genevan "Ordonnances", 1541, we have "le baptême -----qu'il soit administre seulement par les ministres (ministres ou coadjuteurs^{eurs})." ----- "De la Cène --- Que les ministres distribuent le pain en bon ordre et avec révérence, et que nul autre donne le calice sinon les commis ou diacres avec les ministres."(1). The directions are almost the same in the "Ordonnances" of 1576, with this exception that "les anciens ou les diacres" are mentioned.(2). We notice

(1) Meyer. p. 270.

(2) Do. pp. 285, 286.

IV. Powers.

here that certain others are allowed to take part in distributing of the wine with the cup, but that simply means that they are helping in the distribution. The minister is administering the wine as well as the bread.

With regard to Baptism, Calvin discussing the administering of it by women asys-"He (Christ) certainly appointed them (ministers) both preachers of the gospel and ministers of baptism. If, as the Apostle testifies, no man duly takes honour upon himself in the Church, unless he who is called, as was Aaron. I hold that whosoever baptizes without a lawful call, rashly intrudes into another's office. What! while the Son of God was unwilling to intrude himself, shall any son of earth, without any authority, appoint himself the public dispenser of this great ordinance? Even in the minutest matters, as meat and drink, whatever we attempt and dare with a doubtful conscience, Paul plainly denounces as sin. Now in the Baptism of (by) Women, what certainty can there be while a rule delivered by Christ is violated? For that office of the Gospel which he assigned to ministers, women seize to themselves."(1).

In the French Reformed Church slight differences are noticeable in the arrangements for the observance of the Supper, but there is no difference here that it is the minister who must administer both Sacraments. So we have- "Baptism administered by one who is unordained is null and void"(2).

"A Doctor of Theology cannot preach or administer the Sacraments unless he is Minister as well as Doctor."(3). "The

(1) Calvin-Tracts.p.177. (2) Campbell.p.32. (3) Do. p.32.

IV. Powers.

Churches are to understand that it is the part of ministers alone to administer the cup."(1). This matter as to whether elders and ~~éacóns~~ deacons should assist in the distribution of ~~the~~ the wine at the Communion or not, had rather troubled the French Church in the Sixteenth Century. Questions had been sent to Calvin at Geneva on the subject. The reply came- "The brethren of Geneva being demanded, Whether Pastors at the Lord's Table should only distribute the Bread and Wine unto the people, do give this answer; That it were certainly best, if it might be conveniently done at all times, but it seems for the present impossible, and for the future wholly impracticable: For in case God should multiply the number of the people, of believers and churches, and there being so great a scarcity of pastors, we see no inconveniency in it, that Deacons and Elders, being the Arms and Hands of the Pastor, after that he hath consecrated the Sacramental Elements, and distributed the Bread and Cup to them that are nearest to him, may come into his relief and assistance, and distribute them also unto those who are remote from him."(2) This may describe the method of observance at Geneva, and the reasons for it, so sensible and practical. But although this recommendation came to the French Synod with the authority of the great name of Calvin, the same Synod (1563) seems to have reaffirmed its rule that only the Minister must give the cup, if possible.(3). And we find that sixty years later at the

(1) Campbell. p.36. Chap.XII.9.

(2) Synodicon. Vol.I. p.53.

(3) Do. p. 35.

IV. Powers.

Synod of Charenton, 1623, a message came from the Church of Geneva to inform the French Church that they of that Church had adopted the French rule as to the cup-"And whereas their Elders had formerly assisted their Pastors in the delivery of the ^fCalice, they had resolved that it should be done by the Pastors only."(1). This was an accentuation of the minister's part in the observance of the Sacrament.

In the Scots Confession of 1560 it is set down-"That Sacramentis be ryghtlie ministred, we judge twa thingis requisit; the one, That thei be ministred be lauchfull ministeris, whome we affirme to be onlie thei thet ar appointed to the preaching of the worde."(2). The First Book of Discipline also declares the Sacraments to be "ryghtlie ministred quhen by a lauchfull Minister."(3). The Second Book of Discipline adheres to the same view-"Unto the Pastors onlie apperteins the Administration of the Sacraments, in like manner as the Administration of the Word---".(4).

For England, "The Directory of Church Government", of 1574, drawn up by Walter Travers and Thomas Cartwright, for the English Reformed Church which they were striving to have organized, has the direction- "Let onely a Minister of the Word, that is, a preacher, minister the Sacraments, and that after the ~~p~~ preaching of the Word, and not in any other place than in the publique assemblies of the Church."(5).

(1) Synodicon. Vol.II.p.81.

(2) Laing's Knox. Vol.II. p.115.

(3) Do. p.186.

(4) Dunlop. Vol.II. p. 771.

(5) Briggs. App.I. p.viii.

IV. Powers.

The Westminster Confession of Faith, 1646, is quite clear and decided in the matter- "There be only two sacraments ordained by Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord; neither of which may be dispensed by any but by a minister of the word, lawfully ordained."(1).

Why was it, we may ask, that the Reformed Churches so decidedly held that only the ministers were to dispense the Sacraments? This question comes up for treatment in part under the subject of "Validity". It is convenient, in part at least, to give some answer to it here. The reason that the ministers only were to dispense the Sacraments was not because the ministry was believed to be a priesthood of a special kind. We have seen that the Reformers had decidedly rejected that. It may have been partly for the sake of orderliness. That counted for much. It would not do to have all kinds of irregular observances of the Sacraments. But it was ^{mainly} because ~~of this chiefly~~ [^] ~~ly, what is referred to in the above statements,~~ the ministerial office was the preaching office. The great work of preaching made the minister a special person. He was the only person suitable to dispense the sacraments, because nobody was to preach (2) but those in the Ministry, which is a fact to be specially noted. The preaching authorised and authenticated the Sacraments, and so only the minister as the only preacher, properly authorised as such, had to administer the sacraments. Calvin in the Catechism

(1) Westr. Conf., Chap. XXVII. 3.

(2) Synodicon. Vol. II. p. 446.

Westr. Catech. Quest. 158.

IV. Powers.

of the Church of Geneva puts the matter quite plainly- "M. Does the administration both of baptism and of the Supper belong indiscriminately to all ? S. By no means, It is confined to those to whom the office of teaching has been committed. For the two things, viz. to feed the Church with the doctrine of piety and administer the Sacraments are united by an indissoluble tie."(1). It was felt, indeed, that so much were preaching and the Sacraments bound up with each other that the latter were not to be administered without preaching. This was brought forward by the English Reformed Churchmen in the "Admonition" to Parliament of 1572- "And for the sacraments, let those parishes, that are unprovided, repair to the parishes next adjoining that are provided of pastors, that they may use the sacraments as they ought, not without the preaching of the word."(2). The power of the minister to dispense the sacraments seems clearly to be largely based on the fact that preaching is the constituting essential of his office. This also has not to be lost sight of, that the dispensing of the sacraments, whatever theory or reason may be given for it, was set down as one of the main duties of the pastoral office. It has already been mentioned how commonly in Confessions and "Disciplines" and Directories the duties of Preaching and Dispensing the Sacraments are mentioned together as the first duties of ministers. One more testimony to this may here be added. Calvin comments on that Canon of the Council of Trent which runs-"Whosoever shall say that all Christians have

(1) Calvin- Tracts. Vol.II. p.83.

Niemeyer. p.167. N.B. "salutis doctrina", not "of piety".

(2) Puritan Manifestoes". p.132.

IV. Powers.

right to administer the Word and all the Sacraments, let him be anathema." He says- "No sound Christian makes all men equal in the administration of Word and Sacraments, not only because all things ought to be done in the Church decently and in order, but also by the special command of Christ, Ministers are ordained for that purpose."(1).

In connection with what is called "the power of the keys" the spiritual ~~power~~ power, in another direction, of those in the Reformed Ministry, may be seen. It has already been mentioned that priests of the Papal Church were at their ordination given this power, the power it was said of binding or loosing sinners, of remitting or retaining sins. One writer states the position of the Papal Church quite fairly as follows-"The Council of Trent affirmed that our Lord left "priests as His vicars, as presidents and judges, to whom all mortal crimes should be brought into which Christ's believing people may have fallen, in order that they, by the power of the keys, may pronounce sentence of the remission of sins." The Biblical texts assigned in proof of such teaching are Matt. XVI.19.; and John XX.23."(2).

For the Ministerial Order of the Reformed Church the "Power of the Keys" was also claimed, though there might be a changed view of what the power was and how it was to be exercised. There can be no doubt that it was claimed by all the Reformed Churches, for they all had statements and regulations as to how it was, and had to be exercised. For a simple statement of the

(1) Calvin- Tracts. Vol.III. p.177.

(2) The Protestant Dictionary. p.361.

IV. Powers.

claim, such as all would probably have agreed to, we may take the words of two anonymous English Reformed Churchmen of the time of Elizabeth- "Their (the Pastors) authoritie specially consisteth in this, that God hath delivered them the keyes to open and locke, to bind and loose according to his owne will."⁽¹⁾ Very notable is the claim as it was put forward by John Knox and others when they wrote from Perth in 1559 to the Scottish Lords, who were then persecuting them- "Ye may perchance contempne and dispyse the excommunicatioun of the Church now by God's myghtie power erected amongis us, as a thing of no force; bot yit doubt we nothing, but that our Church, and the trew ministeris of the same, have the same power whiche our Maister Christ Jesus granted to his Apostles in these wordis, Whose synnis ye shall ^{forgeve} ~~reteane~~, shalbe forgevin; and whose synnis ye shall reteane, shall be reteaned; and that, becaus thay preiche, and we beleve the same doctryne which is conteyned in his most blessed wourd. And thairfoir except that ye will contempne Chryst Jesus, ye nether can despyse our threatnyng, nether yit refuse us calling for your just defence."⁽²⁾ In passing, we may just notice, that Knox and these others connect the "power of the keys" with a Preaching Ministry,—"and that, becaus thay preiche." The Westminster Assembly, many years after (April 1646), debated on this question. "The Assembly entered upon the debate of the Report concerning "Church Officers"(Ministers) ----- Resolved upon the Q (Question), "Those that are rulers of the Church have the keys of the kingdom of heaven committed to them, to shut it against the

(1) "A Parte of a Register". p.540.

(2)-Laing's Knox. Vol.I. p.377.

IV Powers.

impenitent, and open it to the penitent sinner."- Resolved upon the ~~Q.~~ Q.- "both by the ministry of the word, and by censures and absolution respectively as occasion requires to retain or remit sins."(1). Here we see it is stated how it is the Ministry exercises the "Power of the Keys". It is by preaching, and by exercising Church Discipline. This was the view adopted long before the time of the Westminster Assembly, generally in the Reformed Churches. That Assembly only confirmed and passed on the view. One of the fullest and clearest statements as to how the "Power of the Keys" is exercised is in the Meidelberg Catechism, and as it is a representative statement, it is worth while attending to it in full- "83. Was ist das Amt der Schlüssel? Die Predigt des heiligen Evangeliums und die christliche Busszucht, durch welche beide Stücke das Himmelreich den Gläubigen aufgeschlossen und den Ungläubigen zugeschlossen wird. ^{durch die Predigt des heiligen Evangeliums} 84. Wie wird das Himmelreich auf- und zugeschlossen? Also, dass nach den Befehl Christi allen und jeden Gläubigen verkündigt und öffentlich bezeuget wird, dass ihnen, so oft sie die Verheissung des Evangeliums mit wahren Glauben annehmen, wahrhaftig alle ihre Sünden von Gott um des Verdienstes Christi willen vergeben sind; und hinwiederum allen Ungläubigen und Heuchlern, dass der Zorn Gottes und die ewige Verdammnis auf ihnen lieget, so lange sie sich nicht bekehren. Nach welchem Zeugnis des Evangeliums Gott beide in diesem und zukünftigen Leben urteilen wird. 85. Wie wird das Himmelreich zu- und aufgeschlosse durch die christliche Busszucht? Also, dass

(1) Mitchell & Struthers. p.222.

IV. Powers.

nach dem Befehl Christi diejenigen, so unter dem christlichen Namen unchristliche Lehre oder Wandel führen, nachdem sie etliche ~~mal~~ mal brüderlich ermahnet sind, und von Irrtümern und Lastern nicht abstecken, der Kirche oder denen, so von der Kirche dazu verordnet sind, angezeigt, und so sie sich an derselben Vermahnung auch nicht kehren, von ihnen durch Verbiethung der heiligen Sakramente aus der christlichen Gemeinde, und von Gott selbst aus dem Reich Christi werden ausgeschlossen; und wieder als Glieder Christi und der Kirche angenommen, wenn sie wahre Besserung verheissen und bezeugen."(1). Rather more briefly, and yet just as clearly, the matter in later times, is stated in the Westminster Confession- "1. The Lord Jesus, as king and head of his church hath therein appointed a government in the hand of Church Officers, and distinct from the civil magistrate. 2. To these officers the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed, by virtue whereof they have power respectively to retain and remit sins, to shut that kingdom against the impenitent, both by the word and censures, and to open it unto penitent sinners, by the ministry of the Gospel, and by absolution from censures, as occasion may require."(2).

It early became a settled belief in the Reformed Churches, that at any rate the "Power of the Keys" was to be found in the preaching of the Word. Zwingli pointed this out.(3). The First Helvetic Confession has a declaration about it (4).

Latin Version.

(1) Heidelberg Catech. Questions, 83-85. Niemeyer.p.449.

(2) Westr. Conf. XXX.1,2. Cf. Calvin- Inst. Bk.II(

Bk.IV. Chap.XI.1,2.

(3) Corpus Reform. Vol.IV.P.392.Usteri & V.II.p.341.(4)Niemeyer.11c

IV. Powers.

When we remember that it was only ministers who were to preach we shall understand that this way of exercising "The Power of the Keys" was one belonging wholly to the Ministry.

The other line along which the "Power of the Keys" could be exercised, that by "Church Discipline," was not so completely belonging to the Ministerial Office as that by preaching. It will be well for us first to glance at what Church Discipline was supposed to be. The word "Discipline" was sometimes used in a wider sense than the more common one, to denote the whole regulative constitution of the Reformed Church. We are familiar with the word being so used in the titles, French Church "Discipline," and the First and Second Books of "Discipline" of the Scottish Church. But the word was used more commonly in the narrower sense of a kind of judicial oversight and control and authority of the Church over the religious observances and morals of the people. And this may be said at once, it was to be exercised equally over ministers and the other members of the Church. In practice it was chiefly a dealing with transgressors of the moral laws of God and man, and with neglecters and despisers of the claims of religion and the Church, and with the perverters of religion. ~~Abiographer~~ A biographer of Calvin describes discipline at work in Geneva- "Men and women were examined as to their religious knowledge, their criticism of ministers, their absence from sermons, their use of charms, their family quarrels, as well as to more serious offences"⁽¹⁾. The writer admits it "had to do ^{much} ~~most~~ of the time with offences

(1) Walker- "John Calvin." p.281.

IV. Powers.

which any age would deem serious." The ^{Scottish} First Book of Discipline
prefaces its ^{section} ~~reading~~ on the subject with the following words-
"As that no Commoun-wealth ~~san~~ flurische or long endure without
gude lawis, and scharp executioun of the same; so neathir can
the Church of God be brocht to puritie, neathir yit be retain-
ed in the same, without the ordour of Ecclesiasticall Discip-
line, whiche standis in reprovng and correcting off these
faltis, which the civill sweard doeth eather neglect, eather
may not punische: Blasphemye, adulterie, murthour, perjurie,
and uthir crymes capitall, worthie of death, aucht not proper-
lie to fall under censure of the Church; becaus all suche
oppin transgressouris of Goddis lawis aucht to be tackin away
be the civill swearde. But drunkynnes, excesse, be it in ap-
parell, or be it in eating and drinking, fornicatioun, oppress-
ioun of the poore by exactionis, deceaving of thame in buying
or selling be wrang met or measure, wantoun wordis and licent-
ious leving tending to sklander, do propirlye appertene to the
Church of God, to punische the same as Goddis word commande⁽¹⁾th."
We get a good idea from that, though it does not include all,
what Discipline had to deal with.

The chief means for enforcing the judgements given in
the course of Discipline was in connection with the Sacrament
of the Supper, that was, in connection with that which was the
chief seal of membership in the Christian Church. Because of
transgressions, the Church authorities could suspend persons
from the Sacrament. Suspension meant a minor excommunication

(1) Laing's Knox. Vol. II. p. 227.

IV. Powers.

for a set short period. But a heavier excommunication could be decreed, which would be to continue indefinitely till there was evident penitence and forsaking of the transgressions. Unfortunately, in the earlier days of the Reformed Churches, along with a spiritual penalty like excommunication, there went other penalties which were felt to be much more grievous. Excommunication, involved not only deprivation of the Communion, but also other great disabilities. Those excommunicated were to be boycotted.(1). And other penalties were inflicted. Sometimes offenders were handed over to the civil authorities to be punished. Calvin appears to have not infrequently had this done. And in Scotland, methods were employed which had been the way of inflicting penalties before the Reformation. Dr. Sprott gave a description of them in his introduction to the Book of Common Order- "All the Session Records abound with references to the Discipline of the Church, to "sackcloth" or linen clothes, the "pillar of repentance," and the "branks and jogges". Gross offenders had, in some cases, to stand covered in sackcloth in the jogges, with their heads clipped and head and feet bare, for half and even threefourths of the Sundays of a year. In ordinary cases, excommunicated persons, arrayed in sackcloth, stood at the church door till prayers were finished; they then entered, and, with heads uncovered, occupied the place of repentance during sermon, and went outside again before the last prayer."(2).

(1) Laing's Knox. Vol.II. p.230. First Discipline.

(2) Sprott- Book of Common Order. p.1.

IV. Powers.

It would be because of what often went along with excommunication, that the civil authorities were often very jealous of the Church exercising its jurisdiction in Discipline. In Geneva, Calvin had a struggle for years to gain from the City Council the right of the Church authorities to carry out Church Discipline. James VI, of Scotland, contended strongly at times in opposition to the jurisdiction of the Church. One cannot here go into this subject at length. In time it came to be seen that whatever right the church had, it could only exercise discipline as regards matters connected with religion, and with spiritual censures and punishments. As an early expression we may take this- "Touchinge the censures of the Church, be it enacted that thei be altogether spirituall, and thei deale not with anie penaltie of bodie or goodes."(1).

The chief spiritual penalty was deprivation of the privileges of partaking of the Lord's Supper. This was a plain exercise of the "Power of the Keys". For a fairly clear statement of it we may take this from the Form of Excommunication of the Church of Scotland of 1571-"Lawfull excommunication --- -- is the cutting off frome the bodie of Jesus Christ, from participation of His holie sacraments, and from publique prayers with his church, by publick and solemn sentence, all obstinat and impenitent persons, after due admonitions; which sentence, lawfullie pronounced in earth, is ratified in heaven, by binding of the same sinnes that they bind in earth."(2).

(1)."Seconde Parte of a Register" Vol.II. p.218.

From a document of 1587.

(2) Calderwood. Vol.II. p.85.

IV. Powers.

It has to be noticed that sentences of excommunication were not the sentencing of the convicted persons to everlasting ~~punishment~~ condemnation. However unsuitable and unlikely to effect the desired purpose according to our feelings the methods employed were, there was always the hope, and the purpose to be, in all the exercise of Church Discipline, to bring the offender to repentance and amendment of life. That was highest humanity and a caring for the highest welfare of a human life. Calvin gives expression to the purpose of excommunication in discussing the subject- "10. For when our Saviour promises that what his servants bound on earth should be bound in heaven(Matt, XVIII.18.), he confines the power of binding to the censure of the Church, which does not consign those who are excommunicated to perpetual ruin and damnation, but assures them, when they hear their life and manners condemned, that perpetual damnation will follow if they do not repent. Excommunication differs from anathema in this, that the latter completely excluding pardon, dooms and devotes the individual to eternal destruction, whereas the former rather rebukes and animadvert^{and}s upon his manners; although it also punishes, it is to bring to salvation, by forewarning him of his future doom. If it succeeds, reconciliation and restoration to communion are ready to be given. Moreover, anathema is rarely if ever to be used. Hence, though ecclesiastical discipline does not allow us to be on familiar and intimate terms with excommunicated persons, still we ought to strive by all possible means to bring them to a better mind, and recover them to the

IV. Powers.

fellowship and unity of the Church: as the Apostle also says, "Yet count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother." II Thess. III.15. If this humanity be not observed in private as well as public, the danger is, that our discipline shall degenerate into destruction."(1). Mention of this, that Discipline is for the reformation and recovery of the offender, is made by most of the authorities, and that opportunities be given for repentance to those under excommunication. In the Scottish Order of Discipline it says- "They (the Church) must beware and take good heed, that they seem not more ready to expel from the Congregation, than to receive again those in whom they perceive worthy fruits of repentance to appear; neither to forbid him the hearing of Sermons, who is excluded from the Sacraments and other duties of the Church, that he may have liberty and occasion to repent."(2).

The "Power of the Keys" exercised by Church Discipline and in the way of excommunication, was then a very great, grave and responsible power. Much of this belonged to the Ministerial Order. Yet it was not committed in fulness to any one minister. Reformed Churchmen did not believe in any one man by himself exercising such a power. This was one of the important points in dispute between them and the Prelatists in England. The Prelatic Churchmen contended that their bishops, any one of them, had this power. Whitgift was prepared to go so far as to say that not only had one bishop the power but

(1) Calvin- Inst. Bk.IV. Chap.XII.10.

(2) Sprott. Book of Common Order. p.34.

IV. Powers.

even a minister. He says in his dispute with Cartwright-"And yet I think all ministers have power to excommunicate, if the Church think it good to commit the authority unto them."(1). Cartwright had been arguing that it was the minister and the "Eldership"(kirk session) combined and perhaps the whole congregation, which must have to do with excommunications and restorations. John Udall has his word to say on the subject-"The latter poynt, which is that excommunication may not be done by one man, but by the Eldership (Kirk Session), the whole Church (Congregation) consenting thereunto, is holden by ~~us~~ us, T.C.(Thomas Cartwright), booke 1.page 183, Discipl. Ecclesiast,130 &c., and denied by them, Whitgift, page 662, and their continuall practise; But our assertion is thus proved, and their opinion and practize, founde to be erroneous and ungodly."(2). He goes on to give the proof. Another English Reformed Churchman gives his opinion very explicitly-"It is wrong for a bishop to have the power of excommunication!" (3). And again for an opinion from John Udall- "It is very dangerous to permit so weighty a matter to one man, and therefore, that tyrannie may be avoyded, and this censure executed with greater fruits and gravitie, the order that the Apostle there useth, is still to be observed", (that is-"The Elders have the government in excommunication.") (3).(4)

This which the English Reformed Churchmen contended for

(1) Whitgift. p.223.

(2) Udall- Demonstration.1583. pp. 79,82.

(3)"Seconde Parte of a Register". Vol.I. p.207.

(4) "A Parte of a Register." p.84.

IV. Powers.

had early been recognized as a principle of the Church's Discipline by Zwingli. In his book, "Von wahrer und falscher Religion," 1526, he says- "Diese Gewalt des Bannes nun kommt nicht einer Obergewalt zu, denn sie gehört der ganzen Kirche, und zwar so, dass wenn einer nicht von ihr ausgeschlossen wird, er auch nicht ausgeschlossen ist. ----- Ja, weder der Pabst noch irgend ein Einzelner darf ihn ausüben, sondern einzig jegliche Kirchengemeinde."(1). In the Genevan Church organization the matter of discipline was committed to the Consistory, which was composed of the ministers and twelve elders, who were also members of the City Councils. In the French Discipline it is recognized that great care is necessary in the whole matter of Excommunication. It was stated in the "Discipline"- "Investigation and judgment of scandals belongs to the Company of the Pastors and Elders" (the Consistory or Kirk Session).(2). Suspensions and excommunications could be carried out by the Consistory, but it would be well to have in support the authority of a Colloquy (Presbytery) also. Thus we have a recommendation to that effect given by the Synod of Charenton, 1623- "On those words in the Form of Excommunication- "In the Name and by the Authority of our Lord Jesus, and by the authority of the Pastors assembled in Colloquy, and of the Consistory of the Church"- The Province of Anjou and Poitou demanded whether a particular Consistory might not proceed to Excommunication without the advice and consent of the Colloquy. The Synod judged according to our Church Discipline

(1) Usteri & Vogelín, Vol.II. p.356.

(2) Campbell. p.17. Cf. Synodicon. Vol.I. pp. 58,59.

IV. Powers.

that Consistories might warrantably do it, provided there were no appeal. Yet nevertheless, because of the great importance of this action, the Consistories are exhorted to get it strengthened by and with the approbation of the Colloquy, at least with the advice of the Neighbour Pastors if it may be had."(1). The English Reformed Churchmen of Elizabeth's reign, in their official document of Church Government (Travers' and Cartwright's "Directory"), make it the Church which has to assume the responsibility of "Excommunicating of any".(2). In the First Book of Discipline of the Church of Scotland, the unrepentant are excommunicated "by the mouth of the Minister, consent of the Ministerie (Does this here mean the Elders and Deacons ?), and commandment of the Church⁽³⁾." The Second Book of Discipline gives the power of excommunication to a kind of Kirk Session or association of Kirk Sessions- "It hath power to excommunicate the obstinate."(4). This was just before organized Presbyteries had come into being. And in so authorising Kirk Sessions to exercise this power, it did not mean that the higher courts of the Church, the Provincial Assembly (Synod) and the National Assembly (the General Assembly), had not like power. The last named was distinctly supreme over the procedure of all the lower courts in all things. And for the Provincial Assembly it is set forth- "And generallie thir Assemblies have the haill Power of the particular Elderships whair of they ar collectit."(5). Andrew Melville, in his

(1) Synodicon. Vol.II. p.84.

(2) Briggs. Appendix I. p.iii.

(3) Laing's Knox. Vol.II. p.230.

(4) Dunlop. Vol.II. p.780

(5) Do. p.781.

IV. Powers.

reply to the king's "Intentions", 1585, claimed for the Presbytery (if he means here by "Presbytery" the court of that name) the "Power of the Keys". "Learne, thriddlie, that this presbyterie, conveened in the name and authoritie of the Lord Iesus, hath a spiritual power proceeding immediatelie of God, and nather of angel nor of man, to ruke his kirk, to reasoun, deliberat, and conclude in maters ecclesiasticall, and apperteaning to conscience, whose conclusions, resolutions, and determinations, are of such sort, that whatever they bind or loose on the earth, according to the word of God, is bound or loosed likewise in the heavens: and whosoever contemneth the authoritie therof sould be esteemed of the childrein of God as an ethnick or a publican."(1). In reply to the king's Questions of 1596, somewhat varying answers were given as to who had the power to excommunicate. The most weighty answers gave the opinions that not ^{by} the minister alone, but along with his session, "and it is thought good that the sessions proceed not without advice of their presbyterie", are excommunications to be carried out.(2). As for the General Assembly, it never doubted of its right to have the "Power of the Keys". In the notable sermon by Alexander Henderson, called "The Bishops' Doom", which he preached at the Glasgow Assembly of 1638, previous to the excommunicating of the Scottish bishops, he claims the power to be with the ministers of the Assembly to do this, and he intends by the authority of the Assembly to pronounce

(1) Calderwood. Vol.IV. p.290.

(2) Do. Vol.V. pp. 595-604.

IV. Powers.

sentence of excommunication. He says- "We are sent to Glasgow to pronounce this sentence."(1). During the sittin^gs of the Westminster Assembly, George Gillespie's book, "Aaron's Rod Blossoming", came out. He is a warm advocate for the position of the elders, as ruling elders, in the church. It was only natural for him to give the power of excommunicating into the control of the Kirk Session, and so he writes- "Thirdly, Observe that he (Prynne) disputes ~~all~~ all along whether any minister can suspend one from the Sacrament. But this nobody that I know asserts. The power is not given "uni", but "unitati", to the eldership, not to one, either minister or elder."(2). The conclusions of the Westminster Assembly on the question are given very guardedly, but to the same effect as most of the foregoing. The statements are in "The Form of Church Government". Speaking of the powers of congregational, classical, and synodical assemblies (Kirk Sessions, Presbyteries, and General Assemblies) it says- "It is lawful, and agreeable to the word of God, that the several assemblies before mentioned have power to convent, and call before them, any person, within their several bounds, whom the ecclesiastical business which is before them doth concern. They have power to hear and determine such causes as do orderly come before them. It is lawful and agreeable to the Word of God, that all the said assemblies have some power to dispense church censures."(3).

(1) Peterkin. p.179.

(2) Gillespie- "Aaron's Rod Blossoming". p.157.

(3) Westr. Gov. "Of the Power in Common of all these Assemblies."

IV. Powers.

It will be clearly seen from the above that the "Power of the Keys" in discipline and excommunication was not committed to any minister alone, nor usually even to several ministers together, but to the church courts, in which there were not only ministers but also laymen. The power had to be shared with laymen. Yet in courts, like General Assemblies, Synods, and Presbyteries, in practice the ministers in the exercise would have a preponderating part. And there need be little doubt that in Kirk Sessions, the exercising of the power of excommunicating offenders would lie largely with the minister. It certainly was he who had to pronounce the sentence of excommunication. It was to him that dread duty fell. It is so that we find it is directed in the French Discipline- "Should they (the offenders) still persevere in obstinacy and callousness, the pastor ^{shall on} ~~shall on~~ the fourth Sunday declare of the said hardened and scandalous persons - publicly and by name - that they are no longer recognised as members of the Church, And shall "cut them off" from the same in the name and by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ."(1). The same was the case in the English Congregation in Geneva.(2). And the Scottish First Book of Discipline is clear on this point- "But yf no man signifie his repentance, then ought he to be excommunicat ; and by the mouth of the Minister, consent of the Ministerie (presumably the elders and deacons), and commandiment of the Church, must sick a contempnar be pronounced excommunicat from God, and from the societie of His Church."(3). The

(1) Campbell. p.18.

(2) Martin. "Protestant Anglais a Geneve." p.95.

(3) Laing's Knox. Vol.II. p.230.

IV. Powers.

Second Book of Discipline lays down-"It apperteines to the Minister eftir lawfull proceeding be the Elderschip, to pronounce the Sentence of binding and lousing upon any Person, according unto the Power of the Keyes grantit unto the Kirk."(1).

From what we have now considered, it may be fairly concluded, that as regards the power of excommunication, it is the minister, who, in more ways than one, had a large share in the exercise of it. And in those days it was a real power. Not seldom, we can imagine, a minister would shrink from having to use it, especially when it came to the pronouncing of the sentence. It had to be done according to form, but it would be none the less ^a trying and sorrowful occasion to the minister and all concerned, unless it were the case of some injurious and most evil-disposed offender, when there might be a certain satisfaction felt in justice being meted out. Yet in all cases, terribly would fall the words, as in the ^{French} ~~Scottish~~ Form of ~~1571~~, on the ears of all present- " We -----do cut off and hereby have cut off "N" aforesaid from the Communion of the Church, do excommunicate him, and do cast him out from the Society of the Faithful, that he may be to you as a "heathen man and a publican", and that among true believers he may be Anathema and a Curse ----- Which sentence of excommunication the Son of God will ratify and will make efficacious to him, until the sinner, confounded and abased, before God, glorifies Him by his conversion and freed from the bonds of Satan mourns over his sin with tears of penitence. Beloved

(1) Dunlop. Vol.II. p.772.

IV. Powers.

Brethren, pray God that He may have mercy on this poor sinner, and that this fearful judgment which with regret and great sadness of heart we by the authority of God's Son pronounce against him, may serve to humble him, and bring back to the Way of Salvation, a soul that has wandered from it. Amen."(1). The Scottish Form of 1571 is similar to this French Form.(2).

That exercise of the "Power of the Keys" which had to do with the restoration of excommunicated persons on their repentance, was also shared by the ministers with others in the same way as it was in the excommunicating of offenders. The minister had a large part in this much happier exercise of power. As there was laid on him the duty of pronouncing the sentence of Excommunication, so also ^{to him} fell the joyful duty of pronouncing the Absolution of the repentant sinner. Gladly would he exercise his power in saying- "In the name and authority of Jesus Christ, I, the minister of his blessed Evangel, with consent of the whole Ministry and Church, absolve thee, N., from the sentence of Excommunication, from the sin by thee committed, and from all the censures laid against thee for the same before, according to thy repentance; and pronounce thy sin to be loosed in heaven, and thee to be received again to the society of Jesus Christ, to His body the Church, to the participation of His Sacraments, and finally to the fruition of all His benefits : In the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. So be it."(3).

(1) Campbell. pp.19,20. ~~C.~~ Sprott- Book of Common Order"
(2) pp.65,66.

(3) Sprott- Book of Common Order. p.71.

Cf. The Form of Process of ~~1644~~ 1707.
Chap. IX.2.

IV. Powers

With regard to the ordinary practice of declaring penances and absolutions after private confession of sin to a priest or minister, the Reformed Church Ministry had practically no exercise of such under the "Power of the Keys." That was left ~~behind~~ behind when parting from the Papal Church. It belonged to the priesthood of that Church, but it was not a part of the Reformed minister's duties. In this, we may notice, the Reformed Churches differed from the Lutheran Churches. In the latter the custom of confessions in private to a minister was still continued in a measure, and also the pronouncing of absolution by the minister after confession. The practice, of course, was different in character ^{from} that established in the Papal Church, and confessions were not, at any rate always compulsory. The following, which is from the ~~K~~irchenordnungen of Silesia, 1584, will bear this out-"Wiewol zur beicht niemand gezwungen oder gedrungen werden soll, wie im bapstum (Papacy) geschen, dennoch aber wirt die privat beicht in allen wolbestelten evangelischen kirchen im brauch gehalten, wie es dan die grosse und hohe notdurft erfordert."(1). The custom was followed of having confessions on a day before there was to be an observance of the Communion in the church(2), and even before a Communion of the sick,(3) and on other occasions. (4) Luther approved of private confession at the time he was writing the "Babylonish Captivity", 1520, for he has in it- "The secret

(1) Sehling. Vol.III. p.460.

(2) Do. Vol.I. p.318.

(3) Do. Vol.I. p.178.

(4) Do. Vol.II. pp. 78,132,554.

IV. Powers.

confession, however, which is now practised, though it cannot be proved from Scripture, is in my opinion highly satisfactory and useful, or even necessary." He goes on to say why he approves of it, and also passes some condemnation on the methods of the Papal priests.(1). In his "Short Catechism" of 1529, he has a section on "How the Simple Folk should be Taught to Confess," and in this he gives a form of words for Confession- "I, a poor sinner, confess myself guilty of all sins before God," &c.&c.(2) And he gives a form for the Absolution- "Therupon the Confessor shall say -----Dost thou believe that my forgiveness is God's forgiveness ? Answer- Yes, reverend sir. Then let him say- As thou believest, so be it unto thee. And by command of our Lord Jesus Christ, I forgive thee thy sins, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen. Go in peace." (3). An example of a fuller form, for use at Confessions before Communion, we have in the "Visitations Abschied" of Brandenburg, 1600.⁽⁴⁾

We refer to this practice of private or auricular confession^{and Absolution} in the Lutheran Churches to bring out by way of comparison the position taken up by the Reformed Churches in these matters. Perhaps it will be well to mention once more the laws of the Papal Church with regard to Confession. "The Lateran Council(1215) ordered every man and woman to confess their sins privately to their own priests at least once a year." The Council of Trent, in the 6th. Canon "De Sanctissimo Poenitentiae Sacramento", decreed- "Si quis negaverit, confessionem sacramentalem vel institutam, vel ad salutem necessariam esse iure divino; aut

(1) Wace & Buchheim. p.271.

(4) Sehling. Vol.III. p.214.

(2) (3) Kidd. pp.216,217.

IV. Powers.

dixerit, modum secrete confitendi soli sacerdoti, quem ecclesia catholica ab initio semper observavit, et observat, alienum esse ab institutione, et mandato Christi, et inventum esse humanum; anathema sit."(1). That Canon reflects the opinions of Reformers about Confession, denying the divine authority for it, and saying that private confessions to a priest only are not according to Christ but a human invention. Both the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches were churches of the Reformation, and would in general hold these opinions. But the Lutheran Churches, while holding these views, could think that some kind of Confession, even though a human invention, could be useful. The Reformed Churches departed still more from the ways of the Papal Church in this matter. Zwingli is not against confessions being made, but condemns the forgiving of sins by priests. In his Sixty Seven Articles of 1523 he sets down-"50. Solus Deus peccata remittit, idque per solum Christum Jesum Dominum Nostrum. 51. Qui remissionem creaturae tribuit, Deum gloria sua spoliatur et idolatra est. 52. Confessio ergo, quae sacerdoti aut proximo fit, non pro remissione peccatorum, sed pro consultatione haberi debet."(2). Presumably he would not quite have approved even of the pronouncing of an absolution after a confession.

Calvin does not appear to have been absolutely against confessions, and yet had something different in his mind from the doctrines and practices of the Papal Church. We gather his opinions from some very interesting remarks he has in a letter

(1) C. of Trent. p.82.

(2) Kidd. p.414.

IV. Powers.

which he wrote in 1540 from Strasbourg to Farel. Of course he may have changed his opinions one way or another in later years, but these were his early views-"I have often declared to you that it did not appear to me to be expedient that confession should be abolished in the Churches, unless that which I ~~have~~ lately taught be substituted in the place of it -----

When the day of the Supper draws nigh, I give notice from the pulpit that those who are desirous to communicate must first of all let me know, at the same time, I add for what purpose, that it is in order that those who are as yet uninstructed and inexperienced in religion ~~may~~ be better trained; besides that those who need special admonition may hear it; and lastly, that if there are any persons who may be suffering under trouble of mind they may receive consolation. But what we have most to guard against is this, lest the common people, who do not sufficiently distinguish between the kingdom of Christ and the tyranny of Anti-Christ, may think themselves to be brought back under a new servitude. I endeavour, therefore, to dispel any such apprehension. I not only bear witness that I disapprove of the Popish confession, but openly and plainly set forth the reasons why I object to it; then, in general, I declare that not only are those superstitions in which the Church was involved to be abhorred, but that no law of practice is to be brought in, which may bind the conscience in its snares; for that Christ is the only legislator to whom we owe obedience." (1)

So here Calvin appears not absolutely ^{everything} against the nature of

(1) Bonnet- Letters. Vol.I. pp. 160,161.

IV. Powers.

private confession, though he was far away from approving of Papal law and practice, and what ^{he had} in mind was more of the nature of a quiet conference of intending communicants with the minister before Communion. Views similar to these could quite well be held commonly in the Reformed Churches. They removed the Ministry still further away from what was supposed to be a power of the Papal priesthood, than the practices of the Lutheran Churches did. And in this they were more consistent with the Doctrine of the Priesthood of all Believers. For in the Papal Church laws and Practices, there is the assertion of a special priestliness belonging to one ~~very~~ class of men. That is plain when they declare that the confessions have to be made only to ^{their} priests and the absolution can be given by them. So the Council of Trent taught- "Quia Dominus noster Jesus Christus, e terris ascensus ad caelos, sacerdotes sui ipsius vicarios reliquit, tamquam praesides, et iudices, et ad quos omnia mortalia crimina deferantur, in quae Christi fideles ceciderint; quo, pro potestate clavium, remissionis, aut retentionis peccatorum sententiam pronuncient."(1). The Reformed ~~Church (men)~~ Church leaders departed from any semblance to that more than the Lutheran Church leaders did. The "Power of the Keys" which the Reformed Ministry had did not include this, not private confessions and private priestly absolutions.

The nearest approach to private confession with absolution which ~~the~~ ministers of the Reformed Churches are found to have practised was not at all private. It was by having a

(1) C. of Trent. p.72.

IV. Powers.

general confession and absolution during public worship. Confession is made by means of the prayer offered by the minister on behalf of all the congregation, and then follows a declaration of absolution. One is familiar with this part of public worship in the services of the Church of England according to the Book of Common Prayer. It did not originate, however, with that Book. Such a ~~diff~~ part of public worship is found ~~earlier~~ in Reformed Church liturgies than the Second Prayer Book of Edward VI. The First Prayer Book of 1549 did not contain it. Generally ~~very~~ (diff) in the Reformed liturgies there is a Confession but without the Absolution. An example of this is in the Book of Common Order of the Church of Scotland, which followed other Reformed liturgies.(1). Sometimes, however, both the public confession and absolution are found. Perhaps we can hardly count Knox's Order of Service, which he drew up for the Lord's Supper, when he was acting as minister in Berwick-upon-Tweed, 1549-1550, as a Reformed Church service book. Yet it is very interesting to notice that in it he has a prayer of confession followed by suitable verses of Scripture declaring God's mercy, "and thereafter", so the rubric runs, "ought the minister openlye to pronounce to suche as ~~unfaynydlye~~ unfaynydlye repent and belyve in Jesus Christ, to be absolvyd from all dampnacion, and to stand in the favor of God."(2). More to our purpose will be what is found in the Order of Service of the French-Walloon Church at Glastonbury, which was modelled on Calvin's liturgy of the French Church at Strasbourg, and from which, it is said (3), the

(1) Sprott. Book of Common Order. pp.81,201.

(2) Lorimer. "Knox and the Church of England. p.291.

(3) Neil & Willoughby- "The Tutorial Prayer Book." p.95.

IV. Powers.

form in the English Church Prayer Book was adapted. The description of it is as follows- There is a short exhortation to the people to confess their sins. Then the pastor rehearseth to the people some ^{suitable} sentences of Scripture, and so declares the remission of sins in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, the people either kneeling or standing all this while.(1). Something the same is in the liturgy of the ~~Palatinate~~ Palatinate of 1567. There is confession made by the people through the prayer of the minister, then follows a declaration of absolution and even of retaining sins.(2). This liturgy, however, was affected by Lutheran influences. Earlier than all these was the "Ordnung der christlichen Kirche zu Zürich", 1535. In it there is, as the conclusion of public worship, a confession, and then a kind of absolution- "Lassend uch die armen inn uwerem allmosen umb gottes willen all wag (immer) befohlen sin. Bittend gott fur mich, das wil ich uch fur uch thun. Und gond (gehet) hin imm friden! Der herr gott sye mit uch."³(3). The confession which precedes these words is distinctly a confession, beginning -"Ich armer, sundiger mensch ! ---", and perhaps ^{one} ~~may~~ may read into such words as "Go in peace" a kind of absolution.

Absolution, however, being declared by the Reformed Minister ~~Ministry~~, except in the cases of restoration after excommunication, was not the usual practice of the Reformed Churches, although the leading in a General Confession was.

(1) Cowell- "The French-Walloon Church at Glastonbury."

(2) Daniel. p.67.

p.20.

(3) Zwingli (Corpus). Vol.IV. pp.697,698.

IV. Powers.

161.

There are a few other matters briefly to notice which have to do with the spiritual ~~the~~ powers exercised by those in the Reformed Ministry. It was theirs to bless the people in the name of the Lord. So the Scottish Second Book of Discipline lays down-" It apperteinis be the same Reason to the Pastors to pray for the People, and namely for the Flock committed to his Charge, and to blesse them in the name of the Lord---"(1). The London Provincial Assembly of ~~the~~ 1654 also mentions this as being part of the work of the Ministry- "It belongs to them (the ministers) ----- to bless the people in the name of God."(2)

It was also assigned to the Ministry to perform the marriage service. This is understood in the Genevan "Ordonnances" of 1576.⁽³⁾ In the French Church, at the Synod of Montauban, 1594, it was decreed- "And the marriage shall be publicly solemnized and blessed in the Congregation of the faithful by the Ministry of the Pastors, and not of any elder or deacon."(4). Again for the French Church we have the decree to the same effect worded rather differently- "Marriages shall be "blessed" publicly in the Company of the Faithful: and this through the ministry of pastors, and not of others."(5). The Scottish Second Book of Discipline lays it down- "It belongs to him lykewyse, eftir lawfull Proceiding in the Matter be the Elderschip, to solemnizate Mariage betwix them, that ar to be joynit therein; and to pronounce the Blessing of the Lord upon them, that enter in that holie Band in the Feir of God."(6).

(1) Dunlop. Vol.II. p.771.

(5) Campbell. p.39.Chap.Xiii.

(2) "Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici."

23.

(3) Meyer. p.304. Sect.133-135.

(4) Synodicon. Vol.I. p.160

(6) Dunlop.Vol.II. p.772

IV. Powers.

No other person, not even those of the Papal priesthood, are to be allowed to officiate at marriages, according to an enactment by the General Assembly at Montrose in 1595- "As concerning marriages made be excommunicated priests, or uthers that hes served in the Kirk, and (are) deposit from their office, or be privat persons: The Assemblie declares such marriages to be null; ordaining the brethren of Edinburgh to travell with the Commissars of Edinburgh, that they decyd according to the saids conclusions."(1). The Westminster Assembly "Directory" is not so rigid as the foregoing in its regulations. It is only regarded as expedient that the marriage be solemnized by a minister- "Although marriage be no sacrament, nor peculiar to the Church of God, but common to mankind, and of publick interest in every commonwealth; yet, because such as marry are to marry in the Lord, and have special need of instruction, direction, and exhortation, from the word of God, at their entering into such a new condition, and of the blessing of God upon them therein, we judge it expedient that marriage be solemnized by a lawful minister of the Word, that he may accordingly counsel them, and pray for a blessing upon them." (2) One may notice in passing that here again it is the Reformed minister, essentially a preaching minister, who is the one to officiate. He instructs "from the Word of God", and is "a lawful minister of the Word."

It only remains for , at this point, ^{(briefly) brief} ~~to~~ mention to be made of a very important spiritual power which appertained to the Reformed Ministry. This was the power of ordaining to

(1) Univ. Kirk. Vol.III. p.855.

(2) Westr. Dir. "The Solemnization of Marriage."

IV. Powers.

to the Ministry. Later on this matter must be looked into more particularly. Here it may be remarked that this was a power which was ascribed to none in the Papal Church except bishops. In the Reformed Churches every minister had a ^{part} ~~share~~ in it. It did not belong to any minister individually, except under ~~very~~ very special circumstances, if ever, but had to be exercised conjointly with others. What part each minister had in it depended on the stage or condition at which the church organization had arrived. That was the way in practice. In theory the part of each minister in the exercise of this power must depend on the ideal Reformed Church system as a whole.

II. Administrative Powers of the Reformed Ministerial Order.

In the Papal Church the administrative power of the parish priest was small comparatively. At the most it would only be exercised in his own parish. The administration of the affairs of the Church was in the hands of the diocesan bishops, and supremely in that of the Pope and his legates. It was very different with the ministers of the Reformed Order. They not only had a rule in their own parishes and congregations, but also, as members of the higher courts of the Church, for the membership of which they were all eligible, their administrative power was extended in such way that they had a part, great or small, in the directing of the affairs of the whole Church.

It was the constant doctrine and claim that the preaching ministry were to have the government of the Church, or at any rate, a main part in that government. ~~And~~ ^{and} generally the

very constitution and organization of the Church, as according to their nature they ought to have done, gave the Ministry large power in administration, and indeed depended greatly on it for their working and functioning. Large as this power was to the ministry, neither circumstances nor constitution ever gave the ^{whole} ~~full~~ administrative power in the Church to the Ministry. In the Churches of Switzerland administration of the Church, according to our views, was encroached on by the State. The Church of Berne and its dependencies were specially affected this way. The Council of Berne took a very autocratic control of matters in the Church.(1). It was due to this Council's determination to disallow the church leaders in Lausanne to have much liberty of jurisdiction that Beza and Viret left the place, where they were professors, and went to ~~Geneva~~ Geneva in 1559. In ~~Zürich~~ Zürich and Geneva the ministers had more say and control with regard to the affairs of the Church than in Berne, and yet in these cities the administration of the Church was closely interwoven with the governments of the cities. In the Swiss cantons, the close administrative connection between Church and State had not the same difficulties connected with it as in larger states. The members of the City Councils were all members of the Church. The Councils were supposed to be , and professed to be , as much for the furtherance of the Christian faith and the welfare of the Church, in their own way, as the Church councils might be. In larger States the civil connections of the Church might be very irksome. As an example, one may take

(1) Ruchat. Vol.III. pp. 526, 536-538.

IV⁶ Powers.

what one writer says about the Church in Holland, 1651-1795.

"The Church had to pay a heavy fine for the patronage it received from the State. The civil authorities had extensive and vaguely defined powers, not only over the funds and government of the Church in general, but over each local community in particular. The "Village Bailiff" must have been a thorn in the pastor's flesh, for not only had this functionary a sitting in the Church Council, and considerable general power over the pecuniary and other affairs of the Church, which he sometimes exercised in a very arbitrary manner, but his sanction ~~was~~ ^{was} needed before the pastor could leave his flock, for however short a time, on business or for a holiday, and he had the curious privilege of deciding how long the service ought to last, and of inflicting a pecuniary fine on the Pastor if he exceeded the limit assigned to him."(1). For this last, some of the parishioners might look on the "Village Bailiff" as a useful functionary ! In practice probably things worked much better than the above description conveys. The civil authorities were often most sympathetic for the interests of the Church and Ministry. But undue curtailment of the administrative power of the church officials by outside control, could never be ideal for the Church. A practical freedom for the Church to manage its own affairs was the ideal. Calvin had that ideal before him always even if he could never realize it completely in Geneva. He held that ministers and other

(1) Wicksteed. "The Ecclesiastical Institutions of Holland." p.11.

IV. Powers.

church officials should be the governing body in the Church. Apparently he is making a claim for the preaching ministry to have governing power in the Church in the following passage in the "Institutes"--"We are now to speak of the order in which the Lord has been pleased that his Church should be governed----- he in this uses the ministry of men, by making them as it were, His substitutes, not by transferring His right and honour to them, but only by doing his own work by their lips."(1) He is much clearer in the statement of his views in commenting on Ephes.IV.12. Here in fact he declares a "Jus Divinum" of the Reformed Church government in which the preaching ministry has its necessary part- "The government of the Church by the preaching of the Word, is first of all declared to be no human contrivance, but a most sacred ordinance of Christ. The Apostles did not appoint themselves, but were chosen by Christ, and at the present day, true pastors do not rashly thrust themselves forward by their own judgment, but are raised up by the Lord. In short, the government of the Church, by the ministry of the Word, is not a contrivance of man, but an appointment made by the Son of God--".(2). The French Confession 1559; the Belgic⁽³⁾ of 1561; assert this governing of the Ministry; and still more clearly the Second Helvetic of 1566 declares that the power of ministers is that of governing in the Church, according to the rule of the Lord, and their ruling is to be regarded as from the Lord.(5).

The French Discipline provided that in the

(1) Calvin. Inst. Bk.IV. Chap.III.1. (4) Schaff. Creeds.

(2) Calvin. Com. Ephes. IV.12. Belgic Confess.

(3) Kidd. p.670. Niemeyer, pp. 323, 336. (5) Niemeyer. p.510

Schaff- Creeds

2nd.Helvet. XVIII 15

Consistory, Colloquy, Provincial Synod, and National Synod, all the courts of the Church, a minister shall always preside; at the meetings of the Colloquy and of the Provincial Synod, all ministers of the areas assigned to these courts had the right to be present; and for the National Synod, representative ministers would be elected as delegates.(1). The Reformed Church in the Netherlands gave a similar place to the ministers in the church courts. The English "Directory of Church Government", 1574, laid it down that ministers, as delegated, would have their effective place along with elders, in all church courts, greater and less.(2). In Scotland, too, the place of the ministry in the government and administration of the Church was fully recognized. The Scottish Second Book of Discipline places ministers, elders, and deacons, as those to whom the administration of the Church is committed- "And all these may be callit be ane generall Word, Ministers of the Kirk. For albeit the Kirk of God be rewlit and governit be Jesus Christ, who is the onlie King, hie Priest, and Meid thereof, yit he useis the Ministry of Men, as the most necessar Middis for this Purpose."(3).

In the later part of our period, as in the earlier, opinion, and belief, and practice remained the same. Wherever it was possible, one of the powers assigned to the Ministry was to have for each minister a share in the administration of the Church. George Gillespie, a member of the Westminster Assembly, in the CXI Propositions which were set before the

(1) Campbell. pp.16,25,26,29. V.1.,VII.1,VIII.1.IX.1,2,3.

(2). Briggs. Append. pp.xiv-xvi.

(3) Dunlop. p.765.

IV. Powers.

Scottish General Assembly for consideration in 1647, holds-
 "This Ecclesiasticall Government distinct from the Civill, is
 from God committed, not to the whole body of the Church or
 Congregation of the faithful, or to be exercised both by officers
 and People, but to the Ministers of God's Word, together with
 the Elders which are joyned with them for the care of the Gov-
 ernment of the Church, I Tim. V.17."(1). At that time the
 Westminster Assembly was devising and deciding that ~~the~~ min-
 isters, along with other church-officers, should be in Con-
 gregational, Classical, Provincial, National, and Oecumenical,
 Church Courts.(2).

It is interesting to note that a French ~~Synode~~ Synod
 of 1578 went further than just recognizing the right of all
 ministers to be at Colloquies and Provincial Synods, and was
 for enforcing their presence in ~~the~~ the Church Courts-"Min-
 isters shall be bound to assist personally at Colloquies and
 Provincial Synods, or to serve their Memoirs and Lawful Ex-
 cuses; and in case of disobedience to this Order, the said
 Colloquy or Synod ~~may~~ may judge ~~definitive~~ definitively of their
 neglect, and dispose of their persons."(3). (3)

This power in the administration of the affairs of the
 Church was essentially belonging to the Ministry of the Reform-
 ed Churches. But the exercise of the power by the Ministry
 was modified by the inclusion of lay ruling-elders in the
 Church Courts. From the beginning laymen had taken their part

(1) Gillespie- CXI Propositions. Sect. 7. p.3.

(2) Westminster Gov. pp. 574, 577, 582.

(3) Synodicon. Vol.I. p.120.

IV. Powers.

in arranging the affairs of the Church. We have seen this was the case in the Swiss Churches, where members of the City Councils had their share in the government of the churches. And in Scotland at first, the "Lords of the Congregation" had much to do with establishing the Reformed Church in the land, and in the first Assemblies noblemen, barons, and other laymen sat as if they had their natural right there. But all such was not a definite recognition by the Church of the layman's place in the government of the Church. It was Calvin who gave this recognition in his organizing of the Genevan Church. Dr. Munter well says in this connection- "He (Calvin) gave them (the Laity) seats of equal authority with the clergy in the church court which supervised and directed the religious life of the community." (1). In Geneva this had to be done in conjunction with the City Councils, yet it was made a church arrangement by being properly and definitely included in the "Ordonnances" of the church. And this became an established principle of the Reformed Churches, that laymen were to have their place by right in church courts. Calvin was only a pioneer in this matter. This feature of church constitution could be, and was, more thoroughly carried out in other places. Laymen were given their position in the Church, not in the least because of a connection with a secular authority, but simply as being officials of the Church. Calvin himself would be entirely ^{where it was possible,} in favour of this, and would give it his countenance and advocacy. The English Church in Geneva, 1555-1560, probably more fully embodying Calvin's ideals, had its elders, who

— (1) Munter. "The Teaching of Calvin." p.199.

IV. Powers.

as elders, were governors of the church. Dr. Martin notes this- "A côté d'eux (the ministers) et sur pied d'égalité avec eux en tout ce qui concerne l'administration de l'église, on établi des Anciens, choisis parmi les membres." (1). So in the large national Church of France, which in its early stages was much under the guidance of Calvin, elders as elders had their place in the church courts. In Scotland it was the same. In Assemblies, Synods, and Kirk Sessions, and when Presbyteries were able to be set up, in all the elder had his place. Once even, in the case of George Buchanan, a layman was Moderator of the General Assembly, 1567.

Thus the power of the Ministry in the administration of church affairs was modified and lessened by the part taken by the ~~lay~~ lay element. All the same it was a large power to the Ministry, and one in which each minister had his share. And in the church courts usually in practice the ministers would almost naturally take a leading place.

Even as modified, this power in administration accorded to the Reformed Church Ministerial Order was a great and important power because the Church was great. It was a great power which had to do with the controlling of what was so great and high as the Church. The Reformers themselves had "high" notions of the Church. They believed that to be in it was the only possible state of salvation. Of course they also believed this matter the other way round, that being in the way of salvation placed one in the Church. But let us glance at

(1) Martin. "Les Protestants Anglais à Geneve." p.95.

IV. Powers.

171.

some of the testimonies to the first of these beliefs. Calvin has a word in the "Institutes" on the subject:- "But as it is now our purpose to discourse of the visible Church, let us learn, from her single title of Mother, how useful, nay how necessary the knowledge of her is ----- Moreover, beyond the pale of the Church, no forgiveness of sins, no salvation, can be hoped for, as Isaiah and Joel testify: Isai.XXXVII.32.; Joel II.32."(1). The Second Helvetic Confession has just as decided language- "Communione vero cum ecclesia Christi vera, tanti facimus, ut negemus eos coram Deo vivere posse qui cum vera Dei ecclesia non communicant, sed ab ea se separant. Nam ut extra arcam Noe non erat ulla salus, pereunte mundo in diluvio, ita credimus/extra Christum, qui se electis in ecclesia fruendum praebet, nullam esse salutem certam: et proinde docemus vivere volentes, non oportere separari a vera Christi ecclesia."(2). In this there is the very figure for the Church, the Ark, which was used for the Papal Church. The Reformers in leaving the Mediaeval Church, were sure they had not left the great and true Church of Christ. The Scottish Confession of 1560 ~~has~~ has similar testimony to the above. In the article on the Church are the words- "out of the whiche Kirk thair is neather lyfe, nor eternall felicitie."(3). Then later on in our period, the Westminster Confession carries forward the same views- "The visible Church ----is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God, out of which there is no ordinary

(1) Calvin- Inst. Bk.IV. Chap.I.4.

(2) Niemeyer. p.503. French Version. Ruchat. Vol.VII.p.201.

(3) Laing's Knox. Vol.II. p.208.

Ivo Powers.

Possibility of salvation."(1). To be administrators in a Church which had such tremendous issues belonging to it, was to be entrusted with no ordinary power. And further the Reformed Churchmen believed that their system of Church organization was divine. The French Confession of 1559 gives just what was commonly believed- "Quant est de la vraye Église, nous croyons qu'elle doit estre gouvernée selon la police que nostre Seigneur Jésus Christ a establie, c'est qu'il y ait des pasteurs, des surveillans et diacres."(2). It was something to be considered noteworthy that each minister was assigned a power which helped to keep working that divine system.

There is one other consideration which may be brought forward which has a reference to the power which the ministers had in having their share in the administration of the Church. The Church could occupy a great place in the national life, and exert a strong moral influence in the nation. Meyer is of the opinion with regard to Geneva- "Calvin fait de l'Église non un simple département de l'activité de l'État, mais un gouvernement spirituel fondé sur la Parole de Dieu. Tandis que l'Etat veillera à la police extérieure de la Ville-Eglise, les ministres s'occuperont du gouvernement spirituel de l'Église-Nation."(3). In some measure this would be true of the Reformed Church in every State where it was faithful to the Word. Thus again we say, it was no small power which the Reformed ministers had for exercising as being administrators in the Church.

(1) Westr. Conf. XXV.2.

(2) Kidd. p.670.

(3) Meyer. p.25.

V. The Equality of Ministers.

In Reformed Church documents and books it is frequently stated that the Christian Church will rightly have four officials, viz, Ministers (also called bishops or pastors), Doctors (also called teachers), Elders (also called ruling-elders or lay-elders), and Deacons. To consider these four classes of officials right in the Church, does not mean that the Reformed Churches believed in having higher and lower ranks in the Ministry. Only one of the classes constituted the Ministerial Order, that of the ministers (bishops or pastors). Some doctors might be also ministers or pastors, and so would be in the Ministerial Order, but merely to be a teacher or doctor did *not* place them in that Order. In the Ministerial Order itself there were to be no higher or lower ranks. All in it were to be equal. This equality was there with regard to the powers of the ministry which we have been considering, the spiritual and administrative powers. All ministers had these powers equally, or were eligible to have them equally, that is, they virtually had them equally.

This was very different from the way Ministerial Order was constituted in the Papal Church in which the Reformers had been brought up and from which they had come out. The Papal Ministerial Order was a hierarchy. It was very decidedly a system of higher and lower ranks of clergy. When this system was being called in question at the Reformation, the Council of Trent declared in no uncertain language, that the Papal Church did and would hold resolutely to it, and that there must be higher and lower ranks. The Canons decree as follows- " Si

IV. V. Equality.

quis dixerit in ecclesia catholica non esse hierarchiam divina ordinatione institutam, quae constat ex episcopis, presbyteris, et ministris; anathema sit. Si quis dixerit episcopos non esse presbyteris superiores; vel non habere potestatem confirmandi et ordinandi; vel eam, quam habent, illis esse cum presbyteris communem; ----- anathema sint."(1).

Judging that these ranks and degrees of the Papal Hierarchy were wrong, the Reformed Churchmen held very earnestly the doctrine of the equality of all in the Ministerial Order. They found the doctrine, as they believed, in the New Testament, and they made much of the point that in the New Testament, the words "presbuteros" and "episkopos" are only different designations for the same church officials. Modern New Testament scholarship has largely supported them in this view. And so in the Confessions, and declarations of Church leaders, we find the doctrine of Ministerial Equality clearly stated. Let us take the words of the French Confession of 1559- "Nous croyons tous vrais pasteurs, en quelque lieu qu'ils soyent, avoir mesme autorité et égale puissance sous un seul chef, seul souverain, et seul universel Evesque Jésus Christ. Et pour ceste cause que nulle Église ne doit prétendre aucune domination ou seigneurie sur l'autre."(2). It is generally thought that Calvin was largely responsible for the composition of this Confession, and so we can take it as expressing his views as well as those of the French Church. The Belgic Confession has practically the

(1) C. of Trent. p.137.

(2) Kidd. p.670.

V. Equality.

(1) same statement. Looking at the French Church Discipline, we see it particularly careful to uphold the Equality Doctrine- "Ministers shall not claim any primacy one over another." Where there is a collegueship in one congregation- "Ministers shall preside in turn over their Consistories, in order that none may claim superiority over his fellow ---". -- Further, all titles suggestive of superiority, such as Elders of Synod, Superintendents, and the like, are to be rejected ---"(2) The French Church had apparently at the beginning not avoided using the name Superintendent, as we see in the Confession- "Nous croyons aussi qu'il est bon et utile que ceux qui sont esleus estre superintendans, advisent entr'eux quel moyen ils devront tenir pour le régime de tout le corps, et toutesfois qu'ils ne déclinent nullement de ce qui nous en a esté ordonné par nostre Seigneur Jésus Christ."(3). No office of superiority was ~~meant~~ ^{perhaps} meant here, but ~~apparently~~ misunderstandings did arise, and to prevent any, the Synod of Gap in 1603 passed the following resolution- "The word Superintendent in the two- and- thirtieth Article (of the Confession) is not to be understood of any superiority of one Pastor above another, but only in general of such as have office in the Church."(4). The being an official in the Church gave such a superintendency. The Synod of Rochelle in 1607 ~~reaffirmed~~ ⁽⁵⁾ the above resolution. The French Church was not going to risk any departure from Ministerial Equality by misunderstandings.

(1) Schaff. Creeds. Belgic Confession. XXXI.

(2) Campbell. pp/5, p.5.

(3) Kidd. p.670.

(4) Synodicon. Vol.I. p.227. (5) Synodicon. Vol.I. p.266.

V. Equality.

We look at the Second Helvetic Confession, 1566-"Data est autem omnibus in ecclesia ministris una et aequalis potestas sive functio. Certe ab initio, episcopi vel presbyteri ecclesiam communi opera gubernaverunt ; nullus alteri se preatūlit, aut sibi ampliorem potestatem dominiumve in coepiscopos usurpavit. Memores enim verborum domini- "Qui voluerit inter vos primus esse, sit vester servus"- continuerunt se in humilitate, et mutuis officiis juverunt se invicem in gubernanda et conservanda ecclesia. Interea propter ordinem servandum, unus aut certus aliquis ministrorum, coetum convocavit, et in coetu res consul-^{proposuit} tandas ~~proposuit~~, sententias item aliorum collegit, ~~proposuit~~ denique ne qua oriretur confusio, pro virili cavet."(1). This states the position with admirable clearness, and it is well worth quoting the whole of the Article because this Confession was accepted by practically all the Reformed Churches, the Church of Scotland among the others. And this statement although being so strong on the doctrine of Equality, yet contains the provision for an Antistes, President, or Moderator, ~~and~~ one to preside at meetings of Church Courts, seeing nothing in such a position inconsistent with complete equality of members of the courts. This point will have to be touched on again before long.

In no countries did the question as to the equality of those in the Ministerial Order become more acute than in England and Scotland, and that because in each country the Reformed Churchmen were ^{brought} up against a new and royalty supported prelacy

(1) Niemeyer. p.510.

V. Equality.

and hierarchy. And in no countries was the doctrine of Equality more strenuously upheld. That was the condition of affairs during a great part of our period.

In England there were such noted Reformed Churchmen as advocates of the Doctrine as Cartwright and Udall. Dr. Scott Pearson, in his life of Thomas Cartwright, thus describes Cartwright's views-²The chief weight of Cartwright's criticism is directed against diocesan episcopacy. He considers that the only allowable Bishops are Presbyters and that they are all equal. While discussing the Presbyterian parity he points out that Calvin "misliked that that small preheminance shoulde so long remaine with one , as which in time might breed inconvenience : likewise that I have heard myselfe off Maister Beza which misliked of it for the same cause."(1). One may parenthetically remark here, that the Swiss leaders, Bullinger, Gwalther, and Beza, were from time to time asked questions and for advtise on this and other subjects, and gave their answers to their Scottish and English correspondents.

Equally with Cartwright, John Udall advocated the Doctrine of Ministerial Equality, and states his views clearly and definitely-"That which Christe hath directly forbidden, that may not in any case be allowed but is ever unlawfull: But Christe hath directly forbidden, that one minister should have dominion over another, Matt. 20, 25. Luk. 22,25. Therefore one minister may not have superiority or dominion over another ---

--- In the Apostolike Church, the ministers of the word, were

(1) Scott Pearson- "Thomas Cartwright." p.94.

V. Equality.

none above another, and were subject to no head or president &c. The honor of a bishop, being taken from the rest of the ministers and given to one, was the first step to papacy. Christ did most severely forbid unto the Apostles and their successors, primacie and dominion. Equall power and function is given to all ministers of the Church, and that from the beginning, no one ^{preferred} ~~preferred~~ himself before another, saving only that for order, some one did call them together, propounded the matters that were to be consulted off, and gathered the voyces."(1). Others denied the rightfulness of the hierarchy on Scriptural ^{making its claim} Grounds . This comes from a petition to Convocation, 1585:+"The Book of Consecration claims that it is clear from the Scriptures and early writers that the Church has always had three orders of ministers - bishops, priests, and deacons. This is a flat repugnancie to the Word of God, which shows a parity of ministers ----"(2). And we find that the lordly names and titles of the English Prelates were much objected to, (3) as also the pomp and luxury of the bishops.(4). English Reformed Churchmen were quite persuaded in their minds that a hierarchy and all the showy distinctions of ranks in it were contrary to the simlicity of the true Christian Church.

The position in Scotland was different from that in England. The Church of Scotland at the Reformation began by being organized on Reformed Church principles. These principles got a start and a hold upon the Scottish Church which they did not upon the English Church. And so in spite of all the efforts of the kings to cause prelacy to prevail, the Reformed Church

(1) Udall-"Demonstration". pp. 45, 46. (2) "Seconde parte of a Register". Vol. I 1207
Written Manifesto pp. 67, 126 "Parte a Re" 1. 340

V. Equality.

principles were not easily driven out of the Church. There was the continuous struggle in which sometimes the Church was organized one way and sometimes the other way, sometimes it was a Reformed Church and sometimes a Prelatic Church. James VI did ~~not~~ ^{succeed in making} ~~manage to make~~ his prelacy to prevail in the end, but it was not without strong resistance on the part of the Reformed party with their doctrine of Equality in the Ministry. In 1584 the king was trying to compel all the ministers to promise to be submissive to him, and to be obedient to their "ordinar bishop or commissioner appointed, or to be appointed by his Majestie." Nine ministers protesting petitioned the king in the matter and used the reasoning characteristic of upholders of Ministerial Equality. ~~AA~~. We can gather their views from the following extracts- "As touching the intituled Archbishop of St. Andrewes, called in the letter our ordinar, we answere, that we can not with good conscience obey him in suche an office as he pretendeth, for these causes following: First, nather the titles of Archbishop, nor ordinar, can we find agreeable to the Word of God. For that word Archbishop, by the interpretation thereof, importeth a name of superioritie and lordship amongst the servants of God, which the Scriptures denie to be givin to anie man in the spirituall regiment of the Kirk, as though they should usurpe ambitioun over their brethrein's faith and consciousness ----- And concerning the name of Ordinar, we cannot find it in the Scriptures, nor in anie godlie wrippers, but onlie in the Pope's decrees and canon law. ----- And to leave the names, and come to the substance of the matter itself, we say

V. Equality.

and affirme, holding us upon the ground of God's Word and eternall truth, that it is against the Scriptures to a man to claime superioritie above his brother, who are yocke fellowes with him in the ministrie, and office of teaching."(1). We have there the doctrine firmly enunciated, and with its dependence upon Scripture. This may be taken as an expression of the convictions of the Scottish Reformed Churchmen in the matter for the whole of our period. As regards names, that of Archbishop was specially objected to. "Bishop" could be found in the New Testament, and so, even though having been taken and used in a very different sense, the objection was not so strong against it as against "archbishop", which they said was not a New Testament word at all, and if used, must only be used of Christ, for He was the chief bishop.

The doctrine of the equality of those in the Ministerial Order was not merely held like an academic theory or proposition. It was practised and acted on in all the Reformed Churches. The very polity of the Churches was in accordance with it. We find, also, men ready to stand by it even when they could have had considerable gain by being unfaithful to it. Those men in the Church of England, who upheld it and other Reformed Church principles, by their abilities would in all likelihood have gained high preferment in that Church if they would have set aside this and some other, not necessarily all, of their principles. There were some Puritans who ^{yielded and} were made prelatie bishops. We have ex-
amples ^{in Scotland} of faithfulness to the principle of Equality. James VI

(1) Calderwood. Vol.IV. pp.209-217.

V. Equality.

of Scotland, in 1587, was proposing to make Robert Pont, who was one of the Commissioners of the Church, the Bishop of Caithness. Pont left himself in the hands of the Assembly, and the Assembly replied ~~for~~ him. The kernel of the letter to the king was as follows- "We praise God that your Majestie hes such opinio~~nn~~ and estimatioun of such a person as we judge the, said Mr. Robert to be, quhom we acknowledge (indeed) to be alreadie a Bischop according to the doctrine of Sanct Paul, and qualified to use the func~~ti~~oun of a Pastor or Minister at the Kirk of Dornoch-----
----- But as to that corrupt estate or office, of them ~~wh~~ quho hes bein termed Bischops heirtofoir, we find it not agree-
able to the Word of God, and it hes bein ^{damnit} ~~damnit~~ in diverse
uther our Assemblies: neither is the said Mr. Robert willing to attempt the same in that manner ----".(1). Another case of the same kind was that of James Melville. In October, 1607, he was offered the bishopric of Dunkeld by James VI. He replied, using Beza's classification of those called bishops- "There are three sort of bishops," said Mr. James. "divine, humane, and devilish. I am by the mercie of God one of the first. The second sort, which the king would have sett up again, was justlie, and by warrant out of the Word of God, overthrowne in Scotland, is daylie declyning to the devilish and satanicall, with which it is in substance all one--".(2). His reply was a decided refusal, although he was told he would "be ad~~ma~~nced above anie minister in Scotland."

(1) Univ. Kirk. Vol.II. p.697.

(2) Calderwood. Vol.VI. pp.684,685.

V. Equality.

The adherence to the doctrine of Equality by Scottish Reformed Churchmen was clearly seen in that, whenever the circumstances permitted owing to them being able to successfully act against the power of the king working on the other side, they brought back their Church to that polity which was in accord with the Doctrine. Prelatic bishops were abolished by them more than once. There was a great abolishing at the Glasgow Assembly of 1638. There prelacy was not only abolished, but the men who had dared to become prelates were excommunicated. That was the carrying out of the Doctrine of Equality with forcefulness. And still more do we see the Doctrine being acted on with a high hand when the Solemn League and Covenant for both Scotland and England came to be drawn up and signed in 1643. It contained, among others, these clauses- "That we shall sincerely, really, and constantly, through the grace of God, endeavour, in our several places and callings, the preservation of the reformed religion in the Church of Scotland -----
--- That we shall in like manner, without respect of persons, endeavour the extirpation of Popery, Prelacy, ~~that is~~ that is, church-government by Archbishops, Bishops, their Chancellors, and Commissaries, Deans, Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons, and
(1)
all other ecclesiastical-Officers depending on that hierarchy--"
At this time not only was the Doctrine of Equality in the Ministry triumphant in the Scottish Church, but it also gained a brief ascendancy in the English Church. The long struggle of
(1) Solemn League & Covenant. Sections I.II.

V. Equality.

Reformed Churchmen in England against a hierarchical system in the Church for a time had a measure of success. The hierarchy was abolished.

Now, the Doctrine of Equality did not prevent the appointing of Presidents or Moderators in the carrying on of the affairs of the Reformed Churches. As has been noticed already, there was felt to be nothing inconsistent with the Doctrine in having these, as indeed there was not, unless they might overstep their bounds. It will be well to notice again the clauses in the Second Helvetic Confession bearing on this matter. It declares the equality of Ministers, and at the same time says- "Interca propter ordinem servandum, unus aut certus aliquis ministrorum, coetum convocavit, et in coetu res consultandas proposuit, sententias item aliorum collegit, denique ne qua oriretur confusio, pro virili cavit."(1). This was generally accepted in the Reformed Churches and acted on. Even the most determined on the Doctrine of Equality accepted the convenience of, and the justification for, having such presiding ministers, and they saw that there could quite well be these without disturbing the actual equality in the Ministry.

We may look at the Swiss Churches and notice how they acted in this matter. Some of them, Zürich, Basel, Schaffhausen, St. Gall, had one minister among them appointed to take the lead who was called the President or Antistes. Zwingli seems to have been the first in this position in Zürich. Oecolampadius had the position in Basel. When Schaff in his History

(1) Niemeyer. p.510.

V. Equality.

likens these presidents to bishops, one becomes somewhat critical. He says- "Among the ministers of the Reformation period, Zwingli, and, after his death, Bullinger, exercised a sort of episcopate in fact, though not in form; and their successors in the Great Minster stood at the head of the clergy of the Canton. A similar position is occupied by the Antistes of Basel, and the Antistes of Schaffhausen. They correspond to the Superintendents of the Lutheran Churches in Germany."(1). This description might be roughly correct on the whole. But it is not exactly right. For one thing, whenever the words "bishop" or "episcopacy" are introduced into such a description by way of comparison, there is danger of inexactitude. The correctness of the description will all depend upon what is meant by "bishop" or "episcopacy". If Schaff is meaning no more than that these church presidents had some measure of oversight of the church and ministry of their cantons he is right. But they had no office, which in its essence, either in "fact" or "form" was like a Papal or any other prelatie bishop. The power of ordaining, which is the distinctive and constituting feature of the Papal bishop, did not belong to the Antistes. From the "Züricher Prädicantenordnung" of 1532, we learn that candidates for the ministry were ordained by the laying on of the hands of the Decanus(2). This Decanus was one appointed for, among other duties, the visitation, of parishes. And further, the Antistes had not the control of a diocese in the way in

(1) Schaff- "The Swiss Reformation". p.68.

(2) Richter. p.168 et seq.

V. Equality.

which a prelatie bishop, Papal or otherwise, had. This can be seen in the Zürich Church if we observe its polity a little more closely. Schaff himself tells us that "Zwingli was the first among the Reformers who organized a regular synodical ~~form of~~ Church Government, He provided for a Synod composed of all ministers of the City and Canton, two ~~members of~~ lay delegates of every parish, four members of the Small and four members of the Great Council. This mixed body represented alike Church and State, and clergy and the laity. It was to meet twice a year, in Spring and Fall (Autumn), in the City Hall at Zurich, with power to superintend the doctrine and morals of the clergy, and to legislate in the internal affairs of the Church. The first meeting was held at Easter, 1528; Zwingli presided and at his side was Leo Judae. The second meeting took place, May 19th., 1528. The proceedings show that the Synod exercised strict discipline over the morals of the clergy and of the people--".(1). It is plain from this further description given by Schaff, that when he talks of an episcopacy in "fact", which the Antistes had, there was certainly no prelatie episcopacy either in "fact" or "form". Such would have been impossible where a Synod of the above kind was in control of the Church. And even if the Antistes presided over the Synod, he would have no prelatie power. He was not even the only president of it. There were two, the other being a layman taken from the City Councillors.(2). In this peculiarity of having two presidents, we may mention, the Zürich Synod

(1) Schaff- "The Swiss Reformation". p.69.

(2) Richter. p.168 et seq.

V. Equality.

resembled the church courts of the Hungarian Reformed Church of modern times, all of which, as a rule, have two moderators or presidents.(1). This feature is quite sufficient in itself to dispose of ^{much} ~~any~~ likeness of the Antistes to a prelatie bishop. Moreover the City Council took an important part in church affairs. It had to ratify the induction of a minister to a charge, and it even had the choosing of the Antistes himself.

It seems that, as time went on, the Antistes in Zürich, which as an office had largely derived its influential character from the first holders of it, came to have more the official character. ^{One} ~~Men~~ can understand men like Zwingli, Bullinger, and Gwalther, naturally taking a lead without any office, but ^{might depend more on official position.} their successors in office, not being of the same kind, ¹ This is what Zimmermann gives as his opinion in "Die Zürcher Kirche," writing on the Antistes elected in 1645- "Es ist ja wahr, dass nun ein grosser Unterschied sich fühlbar macht und der frische hauch der Frömmigkeit, welcher auch noch durch Breitingers (the previous and seventh Antistes) Amtsführung hindurchgeht und vielfach an die Reformationsperiode erinnert, sich jetzt mehr und mehr in steifen Formen verliert." ⁽²⁾ On the whole, the office of Antistes in Zürich and other Swiss Cantons, although perhaps slightly inconsistent with a doctrine of strict Equality, did not affect the principle of the Doctrine in the Ministerial Order in general. It agreed fairly well with the statement of ^{Second} the Helvetic Confession which has been referred to.

(1) Revesz & Others. "Hungarian Protestantism". p.69.

(2) Zimmermann-"Die Zürcher Kirche". p.185.

V. Equality.

In Geneva there was a President of the "Company", a body which was composed of the Ministers and Professors of Theology of the City and the Canton. Its duties were varied. It had to do with the affairs of the Church in general, with the ministry, and admission to the ministry, and with the Academy.⁽¹⁾ The President of the Company was called the "Moderateur". This name has been adopted largely in the Reformed Churches as that for the president of all church courts, and in English-speaking churches has the spelling, Moderator. Calvin naturally was the first Moderator of the newly organized Genevan Church. He held the office till his death. After him in the office came Beza, who held it for sixteen years. These long periods of office for him and his predecessor, although very natural considering who they both were, and the needs of the Church for their leadership, looked somewhat like a partial departure from the rule of Ministerial Equality. And so Beza felt. From the time of the death of Calvin he urged that an election to the office be held annually. He could not, however, persuade his colleagues to release him from the office till the year 1580. We may think of him as holding the office by a continual reelection. At last, when he had demitted office, a weekly holding of the office was adopted, which continued till 1831, except for a short period, 1605-1612, during which it was annual, and one man, Simon Goulart, held it year by year. After 1831 yearly moderatorships again became the rule. During the long period when the moderators changed weekly, the office

(1) Heyer. pp.18,19.

V. Equality.

meant very little, and the oldest members of the Company, the Doyens, in a kind of official way acted as guides and representatives of the Company. (1).

In the "Discipline" of the French Church, a Moderator is ~~only~~ mentioned in connection with Provincial or National Synods. The Article runs thus- "At every Synod, Provincial or National, one of the pastors shall be elected- "in low tones and by common consent - to preside over it; along with one clerk, or two. His duty will be to conduct and moderate in all the proceedings ----". He shall be subject to censure himself withal; his duties shall end when the Synod ends; and the following Synod shall be at liberty to elect either the same or another Moderator."(2). The Moderator of French Synods was not to be of such a kind as to be out of agreement with the Doctrine of Equality. "Moderators of Colloquies shall follow the same set of rules."(2).

Scottish Assemblies of the Church were held as soon as the Reformed Church came into being. In fact, it was with the holding of the first General Assembly that the Church of Scotland became constituted as a Reformed Church. The first few Assemblies had no regularly appointed member to act as Moderator. It may be that Knox presided. The first Assembly formally to have a Moderator was that held in Decr. 1563, and John Willock was chosen for the office. It is interesting to notice that the Assemblies, at the first at any rate, were fully conscious, that when having moderators, it would be as well to

(1) Heyer. p.379.

(2) Campbell. p.26. Chap. VIII.7.

V. Equality.

have some small safeguarding of the Doctrine of Equality. To avoid all misunderstandings, as it appears, these or similar words were placed in the records- "For eschewing of confusion, and that everie brother sould speake in his owin rowme with modestie, it was thought good that ane moderator sould be appointed."(1). It was to be understood that the Moderator was not a man of higher rank than the other ministers, but was only there as a help in the deliberations of the Assembly. Provincial Synods, and Presbyteries when they were set up, had also Moderators on a similat footing . One Assembly, that of 1582, which was held at the time when Presbyteries were being set up, took in hand to prevent Moderators of Presbyteries from being regarded as having a special superiority , for it enacted that Presbyteries were under no necessity to send always their Moderators as members of the General Assembly.(2).

There need be little doubt in our minds that the Scottish Reformed Church from the beginning was adhering to the Ministerial Equality Doctrine. Not a few writers have tried to make out in one way or another that the state of matters was otherwise. One may say that there has been a kind of vogue in certain circles to think and write in this way. Assertions have been made that the Church of the Reformation in Scotland was begun on different lines and with different plans for its organization ~~than~~ from what later were followed. The leadership and influence of Andrew Melville chiefly brought about the change. It was largely by that Reformed Churchman that

(1) Univ. Kirk. Vol.I. p.52.

(2) Do. Vol.II. p.568.

V. Equality.

Presbyterian polity and Presbyterian equality of ministers were fixed on the Church. Knox, it is said, even if not a favourer of episcopacy (prelacy), was not opposed to it. The Superintendents, which he and his fellow Reformers set up, were nothing less than modified bishops (Prelates). One of the most recent writers in treating of the Reformation Church in Scotland appears to follow this vogue. It is a vogue which may have been started by Scottish Episcopalian writers. Bishop Russell, the editor of Spottiswoode's History, could write the following in his Introduction to the History- "In 1560, a Parliament or Convention was held at Edinburgh, when the Reformers, with very little respect for the royal prerogative, proceeded to form a constitution for the Church, into which was introduced a species of Episcopal rule, under the name of Superintendency. Being aware that it was the name, not the office, which had given offence to the popular mind, the authors of the Book of Discipline avoided the term Bishop; and by altering the translation of the Greek word, which literally means overseer, they substituted the less displeasing title of Superintendent----- There is no reasonable ground ~~of~~ for doubting that this modified species of Episcopacy, was meant to be permanent, for ~~the~~ persons who promoted it, and took a share in its administration, were not inclined to adopt the system of parity, which was afterwards introduced."(1). It is perhaps statements of this kind which have helped to start the vogue we are referring to. So let us examine the statements.

(1) Spottiswoode's History. Introduction. p.LIX.

191.

V. Equality.

One need not hesitate to say at once that mainly what Bishop Russell affirms is unhistorical and untrue. Can any one believe that the Reformers by a base deceiving of the people would have tried to bring in any kind of church polity? ~~My/fo~~ They were not the kind of men to do so. Moreover, if they had wished to bring in a species of prelatic episcopacy, they had no need to use guile with the people for so doing. There was no popular opposition to it, as this writer would have us suppose, which had to be got over by guile. The people, we may say, would not know enough about the matter to have very decided opinions on church polity, one way or another, at this stage of the Reformation in Scotland. What the polity of the Church had to be rested with the Protestant church leaders both clerical and lay. The ~~people~~ people would ~~be~~ be likely to fall in with whatever was promoted by them. The main body of the people, as the general indifference under the changes of polity in the Church during the 16th. and 17th. Centuries shows, might have quietly accepted either prelacy or presbytery. If they had strong views, it was more with regard to the conduct of public worship, which touched them more closely, than the polity of the Church. So it is want of understanding of the conditions and state of affairs which will allow a writer to talk of the "popular mind" in this matter. The popular mind was only just emerging from the spiritual thraldom of the Middle Ages, and it was still somewhat chaotic. It had not had as yet much teaching or training in Reformation principles.

As for the intelligent and enlightened Protestant people,

V. Equality.

among the population, either of the ordinary folk or their leaders, it is absolutely incorrect to say it was the name "bishop" they objected to, and not the office. The very opposite was the case..It was the office and not the name which was objected to both by the intelligent Protestant people and their leaders. It will be well to emphasise this as regards the leaders, as they are said to have wished to bring in the prelatic office under another name. It was not the name "bishop" which the Reformers and friends of the Reformation objected to so much as the prelatic office of that name which they had known only too ~~well~~ well in the Papal Church. They did not wish even a "species" of that kind of episcopacy. They could have admitted the name "bishop", for the name itself could be used not to conflict with their principles. They never forgot that it, or its Greek equivalent, was used as the designation of a church official in the New Testament. But depending on the New Testament, they rejected the "prelatic office" which had taken to itself that name. And in fear lest the very use of the word, so long misused, might risk the return of the rejected prelatic office, they judged it best not to use the word "bishop". Yet they always contended that minister, and bishop, and pastor, and episkopos, were all equivalent names for the same ministerial office.

One need hardly have noticed Bishop Russell's opinions so much except that, in the paragraph quoted above, he puts forth the kind of suggestions which have been taken up both by Episcopalian and Church of Scotland writers, leading them to publish views like the following : that the Reformation leaders

V. Equality.

in Scotland meant the Church of Scotland to have a species of episcopacy (prelatic episcopacy, of course, for that is what is generally meant by "episcopacy"): that the Superintendents were a kind of (prelatic) bishops, and meant to be permanent in the Church of Scotland: That the "persons who promoted" this Superintendency, let us name Knox specially, for he was ~~chief~~ the leading man of the time, were not in favour of "a system of parity", that is, favoured prelacy.

These views will conveniently be examined by considering two questions- What was the nature of the office of the Superintendents; were they bishops in the commonly accepted meaning of the word? And secondly- Was Knox in favour of prelatic episcopacy? Of course he was, if the Superintendents were meant to be prelates, and we will need no further proof, for he had much to do with the setting up of them. It will be well to consider the nature of the office of the Superintendents first, for in so doing we shall be able perhaps to settle questions about them, and also at the same time decide what indication the nature of the office can give as regards Knox's and the other leaders' attitude to prelacy.

As to the Superintendents, at first sight, judging by some of the duties assigned to ~~them~~ them, it almost appears as if they were something of prelatic and diocesan bishops under another name, but on closer scrutiny the resemblance becomes less. Here is an outline of a bishop's ordinary duties- "A Bishop's chief duties are to ordain, to confirm, to consecrate Bishops and churches, to visit and direct the clergy, and

exercise a godly discipline over them, to institute to livings, to license curates, to appoint honorary canons, to grant marriage licences, and some minor dispensations."(1). The Scottish Superintendents resembled bishops of this kind in some of their duties, we admit. But so do ordinary ministers among us. The ordinary minister may confirm, or what stands in place of it, ^{along with the Session} admit ^{to church-membership}, and appoint a curate or assistant. The Superintendents, however, as ordinary ministers cannot, could ordain men to the ministry ^{which is what belongs} ~~as is belonging~~ to the power and duty of a bishop. But they had no function which corresponded to the power of bishops to consecrate others as bishops. Superintendents had not, as superintendents, the ordaining of other superintendents. In the general oversight of churches in a particular area, according to the demands of the times and the needs of the Church of those days, many of their duties were akin to those of a diocesan bishop. But as a matter of fact, such a multitude of duties was laid upon them that they could not fail to be like diocesan bishops in some respects, and like not a few other church and civil officials. They were like deans, archdeacons, rural deans, parish priests or ministers, travelling preachers, presbytery clerks, judges in divorce courts, ordinary magistrates, public censors of literature and public morals, education officials &c, &c. They were treated as a kind of omnibus executive in matters which the Church of that time was supposed to give attention to. So many duties were laid upon them that it would have been a

V. Equality.

wonder if they had ever been ~~###wonder~~ able to discharge all their duties properly. And they do not appear to have done so. At almost every meeting of the General Assembly for a while they were arraigned on account of their short-comings. And they also found their duties so exacting and heavy that, as the records tell us, they were for resigning on more than one occasion. One may remark, too, in passing, that the very multitudinousness of the duties laid on them may indicate that the office of superintendent was something of a makeshift till the Church could become better organized and distribute duties over a greater number of church officials. A makeshift has to perform many and varied duties.

Now, if in their duties there were some which resembled those of prelate and diocesan bishops, superintendents in the essential constitution and powers of their office were considerably different from bishops. We can notice differences.

1) Superintendents in their ordination were not ordained by Superintendents only, as Bishops are ordained and consecrated only by Bishops. They were ordained by ministers (a superintendent might be among these) and the very form of their ordination was precisely the same as that for ordinary ministers.⁽¹⁾ They indeed were ordained to be Superintendents at once in entering the ministry, while bishops are only consecrated from those who have been already ordained to an inferior rank in the ministry.

2) Superintendents were given authority "to plant" ministers

(1) Laing's Knox. Vol.II. p.144. Sprott. Book of Common Order. p.20.

V. Equality.

in churches, that is to ordain them to a charge. But their office had no inherent power of ordination, it was not supposed to have it, which is the very central claim as regards the power of a prelatie bishop. The duty of carrying out ordinations could be withdrawn from the Superintendency by the General Assembly at any time. Even a Pope could not, so it may be supposed, deprive the Episcopacy of this power.

3) Superintendents had all their duties delegated to them by the supreme authority in the Church, the General Assembly. They were directed as to the details of their duties as prelatie bishops have not been.

4) Superintendents were not the governors of the Church, as prelatie bishops are supposed to be. They were strictly governed by the Church. Spottiswoode is entirely wrong in saying that up to 1571 "the Church had been governed by superintendents and commissioners of countries." (1). They were always governed, as the records of the Assembly clearly show.

5) Superintendents in their main duties differed from those commonly called bishops. The main duties of the prelatie bishop were to rule the diocese and to ordain. The main ^{duty} of Superintendents, that for which they were instituted in the first place, was to journey about their districts to supply ordinances where there were none. The greater part of the parishes were for some time without ministers after the Reformation. The Superintendents had to go about conducting services so that the people might not be wholly without public worship. If they had some

(1) Spottiswoode- History. Vol.II. p.167.

V. Equality.

resemblance to a minister of another Church, it was not in these so much to a bishop as to the superintending minister of a Circuit in the Methodist Church. The Circuit has in it a number of places of worship without a resident minister. It is the duty of the superintending minister to "supply" in all these places of worship periodically, being assisted in providing regular ordinances by other ministers assisting in the Circuit, and also by local lay-preachers. The Scottish Superintendent was not assisted in providing ordinances by other ministers travelling about ~~for~~ ^{like himself} in order to "supply" the vacant churches, but he had to keep putting in as many ministers as he could obtain to fill the vacancies, and to employ the services of "readers" also. There is some resemblance between his work and that of the Methodist superintending minister.

6) Superintendents had no special honour accorded to them as prelatie bishops have. They were not meant to have any special honour. Perhaps we may gather that from what may have been the model which gave suggestions for their instituting. That was the Superintendent in the Church of John A Lasco in London (circa 1550). In its Church Order it was distinctly laid down that there were only three kinds of officials in the Church, ministers, elders, and deacons. ~~From~~ From the ministers a Superintendent could be chosen to preserve unity in all, and for the strengthening of the ~~other~~ other brethren in the faith. He would have more trouble and labour than the other ministers, but in preaching and the sacraments he ^{was to} ~~would~~ have no superiority. (1)

(1) Richter. Vol.II. p.101.

V. Equality.

This may quite possibly have been a "no superiority" model in the setting up of the Scottish Superintendents. Certainly they were like the John A Lasco superintendents in having more trouble and ~~alþöur~~ labour than their fellow ministers. And they had no official honour. They were seldom chosen as moderators. And they were not even given the honour of being placed in the larger and more important charges. Their other duties, even if they had the ability, would make them unable to fulfil the important work of the larger towns. "Off one thing, in the end, we must admonishe your Honouris, to wit, that in appointing Superintendentis for this present, ye disappoint not your cheaf Tounis, and whair learning is exercised, of suche ministeris as more may profitt be residence in one place, than be continewall travell frome place to place: For if ye so do, the youth in those placis shall lacke the profound interpretatioun of the Scripturis; and so shall it be long before that your gardenis send furth many plantis; whair by the contrarie (i.e. not placing the superintendents in them), yf one or tuo tounis be continewallie exercised as thei may, the Commoun-wealth shall schortlie taist of thair frust, to the comfort of the godlie."⁽¹⁾ This, in the First Book of Discipline, is the conclusion of the section on Superintendents.— Truly there were no proposals of great honour for these officials, only for much work.

7) Superintendents were to be ministers of parishes, as well as having their special work as superintendents. This was not the way with prelatie and diocesan bishops. This requirement

(1) Laing's Knox. Vol.II. p.208.

V. Equality.

placed the superintendents in the class of ordinary ministers even if they had specially many other duties besides parish duties. But indeed, their ordination, as has often been noticed was just that ^{very} same ceremony as was used in the cases of all other ministers.(1). And this may be particularly noticed in connection with that ordination ceremony, in what may be called the "ordination prayer" there occur these words at its close, "as by Thee our Lord King, and only Bishop, we are taught to pray." That mention of Christ as the only Bishop at such a point in the service is sufficient to indicate that neither minister-superintendents nor ordinary ministers were being ordained to a ^{prelatic} ~~prelatic~~ episcopacy.

One may with good reason conclude that the Scottish Superintendents were ~~superintendents~~ ^{were} not bishops as is usually understood by that name, and in fact, far from being such. In this agree quite a number of trustworthy authorities; Wodrow, Grub, ~~C. G. M' Crie~~ C.G.M' Crie, Mitchell, Cunningham, and Bishop Knox. As knowing well what prelatic episcopacy is, Grub and Bishop Knox may be quoted. Grub writes- "It has been contended by some writers that -----the episcopal government of the Church was kept up in the person of the superintendents, and that the liturgical offices-were continued under another form. This opinion seems to be erroneous. The superintendent scheme bore only a faint external resemblance to the hierarchy---".(2)

One may add as comment on this, a very "faint external resemblance

(1) See the heading of "The Forme and Ordour"

Laing's Knox. Vol.II. p.208. Sprott. Book of
Common Order. p.20.

(2) Grub. Vol.II. pp.99,100.

V. Equality.

Bishop Knox is still more decided in his opinion about the Superintendents, and he knows well what prelatic episcopacy is, and also something of Scottish Church History. He says—"They were not bishops, nor rulers over ministers. Their business was to "set, order, and appoint ministers where none now are."⁽¹⁾

It may be admitted, however, that the Scottish Superintendents were somewhat anomalous in the Reformed Church System. And it does look as if they might possibly have developed along lines which would have infringed the Doctrine of Ministerial Equality. Why did the Reformation leaders, Knox and the others, favour the appointing of officials in the Church ^{partly} ~~so~~ anomalous and of doubtful possibilities of development? According to what has already been referred to, some have formed the opinion in answer to this question, that the Reformation leaders in Scotland had more or less a hankering, at least, after prelacy. The premisses hardly justify such a conclusion. The leaders certainly did not at once set about organizing Presbyteries in the Church. The reason of that would not be because they had those alleged hankerings after prelatic episcopacy. They had to cut their coat according to the cloth. The ^{most} ~~majority~~ of the parishes were without ministers. However much ^{it had been} ~~they had~~ desired to form Presbyteries, there were not the men to form them of. The First Book of Discipline carried organization in a Reformed Church way as far as it was possible at the time. The Assembly as the governing body of the Church was already recognized. The Discipline

(1) Bishop Knox. "Life of Archbishop Leighton." p.36.

V. Equality.

provided for elders and deacons in the Church, with a recognized administrative place; for the part of the people in the election of ministers; and even for what became the fore-runner of the Presbytery, "the Exercise." Presbyteries were set up later, after they had become possible. They might possibly have been set up rather earlier than they were if it had not been that the progress of the Church was hindered by interferences of the secular rulers.

It may rightly be supposed that the Superintendents were instituted to do work in the Church which in the beginnings the Church had no machinery for doing. There is good reason for believing that ~~that~~^{their} office was only intended to be a temporary one. It was apparently so stated when their appointment was being arranged for. In the First Book of Discipline, in the setting forth of the proposals regarding the office, it says- "Because we have appointed a larger stipend to these that shalbe Superintendents then to the rest of the Ministeris, we have thocht good to signifie unto your Honouris, suche reasons as moved us to mak difference betwix preachers (no suggestion of prelacy there !) at this tyme."(1). There in those words "at this tyme" there is the note of temporariness. And again in the same passage we have it- "And thairfore we have ~~t~~/ thocht it a thing most expedient for this tyme, that frome the whole number of godlie and learned (men), now presentlie in this Realme be selected----".(1). Note the phrase. "for this tyme."

And in the concluding paragraph about Superintendents, there are

(1) Laing's Knox. Vol.II. p.202.

V. Equality.

words with like significance- " --in appointing Superintendents for this present."(1).

There are also a few other considerations which go to show that the office of the Superintendents was temporary. Their principal work was of a temporary nature, and those who instituted the office would know this. They had themselves in person to provide ordinances in the parishes where there would be none otherwise because of the lack of ministers, and they had to keep on settling ministers. The need of such work would gradually pass away as the vacant parishes were settled with regular ministers. And indeed it did pass away, except of course there would be the normal inducting of men into the occasional vacancies of a normal state of affairs in the Church. There is also this which has been pointed out, that in the Book of Order, among the regular officials of the Church, no mention is made of Superintendents.(2). This is some evidence that the office was not considered one of the kind to set down as being one of the regular and permanent offices of the Church.

And this fact cannot be gainsaid, the office was not permanent. It did continue only for a time, and a comparatively short time. The ~~late~~ late Principal Story considered that it was one of the "most carefully devised institutions of the Reformed Church, adapted to be permanent."⁽³⁾ Whether carefully devised or not, it did not prove to be permanent. The Church must very soon ^{have} lost conceit of it, for no more than the first

(1) Laing's Knox. Vol.II. p.208.

(2) Mitchell- "The Scottish Reformation". pp.146-150

Cf. Spratt- Book of Common Order. pp.13-19.

(3) Story-"The Apostolic Ministry". p.255.

V. Equality.

five were ever afterwards appointed. Sprott seeks to explain the passing away of the Superintendency, but seems somewhat away from the facts when he says- "The Superintendent system was regarded as the most effective, and what proved fatal to it was the subsequent controversy betwixt Prelacy and Presbytery."⁽¹⁾ To begin with, it was anything but effective. How could it be ~~effective~~ effective in ~~face~~ face of all that was expected of it and laid upon it? If it had been effective, its continuance in the Church would probably have been longer, and almost certainly more would have been appointed to the office. It seems to have begun to be disappointing almost from the beginning. And it was not because of the "controversy betwixt Prelacy and Presbytery" it ceased to be. It was for various reasons. Its original main duty was gone, as we have been noticing, in course of time. Its way also of handling other affairs of the Church came to be better done by other agents. There was the danger, too, which no doubt Reformed Churchmen felt, that this anomalous office, with such responsibilities and duties laid on it might develop contrary to the "no superiority" principle of the Church, and so they did not move for its continuance. Indeed ministers with similar duties, but still more ^{fully} under the control of the Assembly were appointed, viz.-Commissioners, and Visitors. They could still less infringe on the Ministerial Equality, or assume prelatie position. The actual bringing in of men of a prelatie kind in some degree, called bishops, even if not the controversy

(1) Sprott- "Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland."
p.191.

V. Equality.

tended to oust Superintendents, Commissioners, and "Visitors", and indeed, ~~the~~ bishops of James VI in the end, ousted the Reformed ~~Church~~ Church ^{itself} for a season. There was never any attempt afterwards to revive the Superintendency. The usefulness of the office, whatever it had been, had been temporary, and ~~it~~ as we have reason to believe had been meant to be temporary.

Thus the anomalous office of Superintendent in the Scottish Church, with its non-prelatic character and with the temporariness about it, does not much disturb the Doctrine of Equality in the Church, and we need not conclude in the least, that, because Knox and the other Reformation leaders brought about the instituting of it, they were meaning to organize the Church of Scotland on a prelatic basis, or were hankering after prelacy, or were anything but just Reformed Churchmen with Reformed Church ideals, not fully realisable at first.

So far, then, as Knox had to do with the Superintendency, we need not conclude that he was in ~~any~~ favour of a prelatic episcopacy. And we have no other reasons of any cogency for thinking that Knox favoured, or was even indifferent about, prelatic episcopacy being in the Church. The following considerations may help us to come to conclusions of this kind on the question--

1) It is well known that Knox, when in England, had, in 1552, the offer of the Bishopric of Rochester, and refused it. Hume Brown thinks that, "though he refused it, this was from no conviction of the sinfulness of Episcopacy." (1). The point is

(1) Hume Brown- "Life of Knox". Vol.I. pp.92,93.

V. Equality.

doubtful. When he refused, he knew what the episcopacy of the Reformation Church in England was. If he had been enamoured of that episcopacy, he might have accepted the offer. He was indeed ^sdisatisfied with the Reformation in England including its episcopacy. His bias at that time, we can believe, would be against prelates because of what he knew of them in the Papal Church. The words of Wishart's translation of the First Helvetic Confession would be well known to him, and he would probably agree with these- "Wherefore we knowe not them that are heedes and pastors in name onely, nor yet the Romenishe heedes."(1). There was too much of the "Romenishe heedes" about prelates to suit Knox even

at that stage in his career. *Of the English Church he had thought in 1547 - "the Paipes name being suppressed, his lawes and corruptions remaned in full vigour"; (1. a.)*

2) Later in his life it would not have been likely that, after having been so long under the instruction and influences of Calvin in Geneva, he wpuld have been in the least favourable to prelatic episcopacy. Calvin was not.

3) The English Congregation in Geneva which Knox ministered to, was of a Presbyterian order. It had all the distinctive features of the Reformed Church so far as one congregation could have them. So the writer on this church says- "Les fondateurs de l'Eglise anglaise de Genève y instituèrent les trois charges de ministres ou pasteurs, d'anciens et de diacres, conformément au pur modèle presbyterien emprunte aux Ecritures."(2). One may believe that Knox was thoroughly in agreement with the constitution of his Genevan church. In Geneva and in his church there he would become a confirmed Reformed Churchman. With the ~~the~~

(1) Wodrow Miscellany. p.17.

(2) Martin-"Les Protestant Anglais à Genève." p.94.

(1. a) Laing's Knox - Vol. I. p. 185.

V. Equality.

Reformed Church ideals he would go to take up his great reforming work in Scotland, and in these ideals would not be mixed up by him, we may confidently say, any purposes of a "species" of prelatic episcopacy for the Church of his native country.

4) When the Second Helvetic Confession was brought before the Church of Scotland in 1566, and it was approved of, containing among the rest, the statements on Ministerial Equality, we may be sure Knox was not behind any others, after having made a careful examination and scrutiny^{of} its terms, in accepting it with its Ministerial Equality Doctrine and all.

5) Knox, too, was perfectly well aware what was the character of the prelatic episcopacy which was developing in England in Elizabeth's reign. He knew what Reformed Churchmen in England were suffering from the bishops of the new English hierarchy. There was a letter written from the Church of Scotland in Decr., 1566, to the "Bishops and Pastors of God's Church in England", pleading with the bishops to treat the Reformed Church party better. Knox would be sure to have something to do with that letter, in fact there is testimony to that effect in the Fifth Book of his History, where it says- "John Knox formed the letter in the name of the Assembly". The precise value of that statement is not sure. But at any rate it is some evidence of what, on other grounds, we might think Knox would be likely to do.

6) We have noticed how in earlier days he refused the bishopric of Rochester. He did not wish in later life to be a prelate. Lorimer quotes from a letter written by Knox to a friend in England in 1568 in which he says-" I would most gladly pass through

V. Equality.

the course that God ~~hath~~ hath appointed to my labour, giving thanks to His holy Name for that it hath pleased His mercy not to make me a lord bishop, but a painful preacher of His blessed Evangel."(1).

7) In 1572 Knox received a letter from Beza which contained a strong condemnation of prelatic episcopacy- "I would remind yourself and the other brethren, that as bishops brought forth the Papacy, so will false bishops- the relicts of Popery- bring Epicurism into the world. Let those who devise the safety of the Church avoid this pestilence, and when in process of time you shall have subdued that plague in Scotland, do ~~not~~ not, I pray you, ever admit it again---"(2). Beza is aware there is a struggle going on against the introduction of a prelacy again into Scotland, and he seems to take it for granted that Knox will be out to prevent the introduction. We can hardly imagine Knox reading that letter and all the time having hankerings after prelacy himself.

8) When through the manoeuvrings of the Regent Morton a bishop of a kind was again to be set up in St. Andrews, we have the testimony of an eye-witness as to how Knox acted on that occasion. The bishop to be set up was rather a make-believe one, little more than one in name. Yet Knox opposed the making of this official in the Church ~~anything~~ having the mere semblance of a prelate. This is perfectly clear from the account which Bannatyne, who was present and with Knox in St. Andrews at the time, gives of the whole matter.(3). What kind of opposition would Knox have

(1) Lorimer-"John Knox and the Church of England." p.154.

(2) Laing's Knox. Vol.VI. p.614.

(3) Bannatyne- "Memoriales". pp.227,224.

V. Equality.

have made if it had been a full-blooded prelacy which was being set up.[?] Cunningham seems to suggest that Knox opposed because he believed there had been simony in the appointment of the new bishop.⁽¹⁾ Bannatyne does not say that. He affirms- "~~But~~ only that he spake for discharge of his conscience; and that the Kirke of Scotland suld not be subject to that ordre which then was used (viz. prelacy) considering the Lordis of Scotland had subscryvit, and also confirmed in Parliament, the ordore alreadie and long agoe appointed in the Buike of Discipline." (2). There can be no doubt of Knox's opposition to bishops being appointed, *+ of his adherence to the non-prelatic polity already set up.*

8) Later when he saw that in spite of all his opposition, Morton was succeeding in bringing his kind of bishops into the Church, and was determined to have them there, Knox tried to get the best arrangements under the circumstances. But that is not evidence that he was agreeing with episcopacy of the prelatic kind. He was trying to avert the worst consequences of what he could not prevent. He was an old and dying man, fighting what seemed to be a losing battle, yet when he could not prevent some approach to ~~prelacy~~ a kind of prelatic episcopacy, he was doing his best to make that episcopacy no prelacy, and at the least to neutralise the evils of the new move.

If one will take all the above matters into consideration, one can hardly do otherwise than conclude that Knox was neither in favour of a prelacy, nor indifferent to it, but opposed to it.

It has been thought necessary to go into these matters

(1) Cunningham. Vol. I. p. 342. (2) Bannatyne. pp. 22, 23.

V. Equality.

with detail and at some length in order to try and make it clear that it is a mistake to imagine that in the Superintendency and in John Knox can be found any grounds for holding that the Church of Scotland after the Reformation was not intended to be a Reformed Church with the doctrine of Ministerial Equality, but a Church with some kind of prelacy, modified or otherwise. It can be stated unhesitatingly that the leaders of the Reformation in Scotland were consistent Reformed Churchmen, and for their Church they had no purposes contrary to the doctrine of Equality in favour of a prelacy. The Church of Scotland after the Reformation began in line with the other Reformed Churches.

Before leaving the subject of the Doctrine of Equality for the Reformed Ministerial Order, it is perhaps necessary to state that of course the equality is an official one. The late Principal Story does not seem to have understood that, and in consequence he makes some observations which are quite beside the mark. He says- "For Presbytery, we must remember, does not mean that questionable entity called "Presbyterian parity". ----- It is not exhibited even in the Church (presumably, the Church of Scotland) of which it is supposed to be a distinctive principle. Apart from the imparities created by individual character and genius, there are the imparities unavoidable under any active and intelligent organization. He who is "primus inter pares" is for the time being as much "caeteris impar" as if they were not his peers. The Moderator of a Presbytery or Assembly is the

temporary president, with powers belonging as specially to his office as if he were a superintendent. The difference between the prerogatives of the minister of a parish and those of the minister of an unendowed chapel is as distinct as if the one and the other belonged to a separate order of ecclesiastics. If Presbyterian parity exist at all in more than in name, it is as much infringed by a Commission of the General Assembly being empowered to exercise occasionally, and inconveniently, those duties of supervision which were discharged regularly and without friction or offence by the duly constituted superintendents of the Church of the Reformation."(1). Dr. Story was here writing with advocacy of the office of the Superintendents. ^{It} ~~They~~ is a rather ~~glorified~~ office he appears to be seeing. Distance of time has perhaps lent the enchantment, and also perhaps made indistinct some of the frictions and other shortcomings of the Superintendency. But his advocacy has led him into some confusion of thought as to "Parity" or "Equality". He need not have mentioned the "imparities created by individual character and genius." The Ministerial Equality of the Reformed Church is an official equality. Reformed Churchmen of the 16th. and 17th. Centuries would not have been so foolish as to hold forth a doctrine that those in the Ministry are to have an intellectual, or moral, or spiritual equality. They desired for the Ministry that all in it would rise as high in these respects as possible. But they knew, of course, that some would always be more eminent in character and abilities and spiritual attainment than others and that consequently they would exercise most likely

(1) Story- "The Apostolic Ministry in the Scottish Church" pp. 255, 256.

V. Equality.

a personal influence and authority even more than their fellows. They could have found no equality doctrine from Scripture which would have gone contrary to that, even if they had desired to find such. But they knew perfectly well that ministers of natural ability and spiritual power would always be of the ^{greatest} ~~greatest~~ benefit in taking a personal lead in the Church. The Doctrine of Ministerial Equality taught this, that those in the Ministry were according to office all equal. It was an equality of office that was set forth. There were to be no ranks and classes in the Ministry. Dr. Story put forward the case of a Moderator of Presbytery or Assembly, and he might ^{have} ~~of~~ added, of Synod, as showing that there is not this Equality in a Reformed Church professing to hold by it. That the position of Moderator does not infringe the Equality has already been dealt with in this chapter. A few more remarks may be made. Dr. Story has noticed that the position of Moderator is temporary. That in itself is almost enough to take from it what might be of rank or class in it. But all notion of rank or class is taken away when it is remembered that the Moderator was not intended to have ruling authority over his fellow ministers. He personally could not command ~~any/compound~~ any member of the church court over which he presided. He himself was subject to the order of the court. He only presided to guide ~~affairs~~ according to the rules and the expressed will of the members by majorities. He only had his place in the church court by the same right as all the other members had, and he was made Moderator by the will of his fellows, who were all equally eligible with him for the office. If he was "primus inter pares" in some respects,

V. Equality.

~~He was~~ he was "humilissimus aut novissimus inter pares" in other respects, for he was not to express his own opinions freely as other members could, but to give the sense of the meeting, and if there was a vote probably his vote would come last, and in all, he particularly had to be the servant of all. We would not say in any case he was "Caeteris impar", for that might suggest a real inferiority, and he was not an inferior. The fact of the matter is, the holding of the office of Moderator, so far as ministerial office is concerned, did not make a man really either above or below his fellows.

Dr. Story also used another illustration to show that the Ministerial Equality does not exist really in the Church professing to have it. He affirmed that what is really a difference of rank exists between the minister of a parish and the minister of an unendowed chapel. He ~~does~~^{did} not say which he would consider had the higher rank, and one does not ^{know} what he meant by an unendowed chapel. But if both men are ministers of the Church, the differences of their spheres of labour cannot make one of higher rank than the other. One may have more money to spend than the other, and one may have a different social position than the other, and one may have a larger number of people to minister to than the other, but these circumstances do not at all affect the equality of office to both in the Ministry.

Dr. Story further, in pointing out what features he thinks show the lack of Equality in actual practice in the Church, puts forward a Commission of the General Assembly. He says, as quoted above- "If Presbyterian parity exist at all in more

V. Equality.

than in name, it is as much infringed by a commission of the General Assembly being empowered to exercise----- supervision," as by duly constituted superintendents. Already in this chapter the attempt has been made to show that the Superintendents cannot properly be said to have infringed the Equality. Still more sure is it that a Commission of Assembly would not do so. The scheme of Ministerial Equality is not necessarily impaired by the controlling authorities under which, of some kind, ministers must be. It depends on what position is given to the controlling authority. ^{Equality} ~~It~~ is impaired when ~~priests~~ prelates are the controlling authorities, not because of the mere control, but because there are prelates there at all exercising as in higher rank a control. If all ministers are under one and the same authority controlling them, that, so far as being common to them all alike, will be a part of the Equality. It might be a civil government. That would be unsatisfactory, not because ^{of} its infringing on parity, but because it would be control in the Church by an outside power. In the Reformed Churches, the control is by the properly constituted church authorities according to the Church Polity. These authorities are largely composed of ministers. Each minister has share in the controlling authorities, directly or indirectly, and when the control is being exercised over himself, it is by his peers. Commissions of Assembly, of any kind, are all part of this controlling system of the Church, in which every minister has some share, and to which every minister is equally subject. All of this kind, instead of infringing on the

V. Equality.

"Presbyterian parity," agrees well with it, and more so than Superintendents could, who were somewhat, as has been previously said, anomalous in the Reformed Church.

The observations of Dr. Story have been useful in helping to bring out a little more clearly what the Doctrine of Ministerial Equality stands for. Whatever views we may have as to the position of a "primus inter pares" in the Church affairs, we can settle in our own minds that the Reformed Church minister by reason of his office, whether in Assemblies, or Synods, or Presbyteries, or parishes, or chapels, or under various church controls of Moderators or Commissions, was always "Par inter Pares."

It may not be agreed that the Doctrine of Equality in the Ministerial Office is right and good. Some have scoffed at it. Certain of Elizabeth's clergy denied that the parity ought to belong to the Ministerial Order, or could. It is not possible here to set about the justification of it, and to attempt to prove that it is right and valuable and possible. It can only be repeated that it was accepted as a Scriptural doctrine for the Ministry from the first organizations in the Reformed Churches. It has been adhered to as a principle of these ~~Chrch~~ Churches to the present time along the lines of the Article in the Second Helvetic Confession. It is an essential principle of the Reformed Ministerial Order, and it acts and reacts on the Church Polity. If it were to be renounced, then it would result in, either for better or worse, a radical change both in the Ministerial Order and the Church. This will plainly appear.

V. Equality.

For the very Polity functions amidst and on a basis of equalities. No one Church, as Rome had been, had to be officially superior to, and dominant over, other Churches of other lands. No church or congregation had to be officially superior to any other church or congregation in any country. And church officials having the same duties had not to be officially superior to others. Von Hoffmann quotes a statement on the subject made by the Synod of Emden¹⁵⁷¹ which briefly and clearly sets forth the position - "Nulla Ecclesia in alias, Nullus minister in ministros, nullus Senior in Seniores, Diaconus in Diaconos, primatum seu dominationem obtinebit, sed potius ab omni et suspitione et occasione cavebit."(1)

(1) Von Hoffmann- "Das Kirchenverfassungsrecht der niederlandischen Reformierten." p.111.

VI. The Control
 Of the Ministerial Order.

Having now looked into the powers and position of the Reformed Ministerial Order, we must make some examination of the Control under which the Order exercised its powers. The Reformed Churches were the last one would think of to be careless about control and government over Ministers. They had too high a conception of the Ministry to permit them to imagine it would be well that each one in the Ministry should go on his own way independently to do according to his own inclinations, some of which might be bad, without any directing or authoritative guidance or regulations of discipline. They had been made aware only too clearly of the evils of lax discipline among both the secular and regular clergy of the Mediaeval Church. The Reformation was not merely a pietistic revival, though there was much of a spiritual piety working in and through it and inspiring it. But it was eminently a great moral and theological and ecclesiastical reform movement. And in such a movement it was natural for there to be the persuasion that ~~the~~ the Ministry must be under control to keep it in the right way as regards moral behaviour, theological beliefs, and ecclesiastical usages and practices. The Reformed Churches were not behind in this matter. Though the following is a rather late expression of opinion in our period, giving the views of George Gillespie, one may fairly say it will stand for the whole period. In "Aaron's Rod Blossoming" he says- "As the faults of church officers deserve the greatest censures, so, in all reformed churches, where the free exercise and administration of them is

VI. Control.

received, there is greatest security of discipline against church officers, and especially against ministers of the word, when any such are, upon just proof, convicted of scandal."(1). If an earlier opinion in this matter is required, the words of Calvin in the "Institutes", in the chapter concerning discipline- "We shall speak first of the common discipline to which all ought to be subject, and then proceed to the clergy, who have besides that common discipline one peculiar to themselves."(2). Calvin there would place the ministers under all the ordinary control of the Church over the people, and under some extra control.

It was natural that, in the first stages of the Reformation, the Civil Authority would, in certain countries at any rate, exercise some control over the Ministry. The Editor of Spottiswoode's History of the Church of Scotland says- "In all the Kingdoms of Europe, to which the principles of the Reformation extended, its progress was marked by the singular desire of putting into the hands of the temporal sovereign, the power which had just been wrested from the bishop of Rome."(3) This statement, to say the least of it, is ^{a very} ~~very~~ inexact one. There was no "singular desire" to put any power over the Church into the hands of any temporal sovereign, least of all the power which the Pope had exercised. The Reformers were willing to have, and even demanded the help of the temporal authorities

(1) Gillespie-"Aaron's Rod Blossoming." p.146.

(2) Calvin- Inst. Bk.IV. Chap.XII.1.

(3) Spottiswoode- Hist. Introd. p.lvii.

VI. Control.

in the way of protecting their efforts and furthering a true Reformation, but they were for giving no further power over the Church, than ^{what} they could not avoid, to civil authorities. The above statement, however, points to a state of affairs which did come about. The Pope's authority had been cast off. For a time after that the civil authorities did exercise considerable ~~authority~~ power in the Churches of the Reformation, in most countries. And their control in some measure was over the Ministry. The Pope's authority had been over ~~every~~ ^{every} man in Ministerial Orders in the whole of the Mediaeval Church. If there was to be any control of the Ministry in the Churches of the Reformation, having broken off from the former authority, other authorities had to come forward. And it was just the secular powers which had enabled the Church in a number of the States to throw off the Papal authority. It was natural, then, that these secular powers at the beginning should assume some control of the Church and Ministry, especially as there were no other authorities to fall back on. As yet no fully recognized church authorities had come into being. The Churches were not organized yet on the new Reformation basis, and so had no governments of their own which were functioning. So they were obliged to have the civil authorities arranging and controlling church affairs to a considerable extent. In the Lutheran Churches the civil control is very marked, and continued after Reformation times. It was to be seen also in the Reformed Churches in certain countries, perhaps most of all in Switzerland, and continued there in some measure.

VI. Control.

Let us look at Zürich first. Zwingli there was able to bring about the organization of a regular Synodical ^{Church} ~~Church~~ Government. A Synod was set up which would meet twice a year. It had in it those who represented the City Authorities:- "Il y a toujours un des bourgmâtres de la ville, avec huit autres seigneurs, tirés du grand et du petit conseil, qui assistent à ce synode au nom du magistrats."(1). It had two presidents, one chosen from the Ministers and one from the city councillors.⁽²⁾ To this Synod all the ministers of the Canton had to render account. Thus it can be seen that the State, by its representatives in the Synod, had share in the control of the Ministry. And it had a further control. The civil authorities had the ratifying of the placing of ministers in their charges, and as regards the Synod, the members of it had to take an oath (those who were ministers) to teach aright the Holy Gospel and the Word of God and to be subject to the City Authorities.⁽²⁾ It almost seems as if the civil authorities had the larger control of the Ministry. The Synod itself exercised a strict oversight. Zimmermann relates that even Bullinger once came in for a gentle censure from it. It was with regard to his preaching- "Er ist zu mild in seinen Predigten, sollte etwas tapferer, rauher, härter, ^{rasser} ~~rasser~~ sein, besonders was die Händel des Rechts betrifft."(3). The Second Helvetic Confession gave stern powers over the Ministry to be exercised by Synods:- "At- qui debet interim justa esse inter ministros disciplina.

(1) Ruchat. Vol.II. p.42 et seq.

(2) Richter. Vol.I. p.168 et seq.

(3) Zimmermann- "Die Zürcher Kirche". p.51.

VI% Control.

Inquirendum enim diligenter in doctrinam et vitam ministrorum, in Synodis. Corripiendi sunt peccantes a senioribus, et in viam reducendi, si sunt sanabiles, aut deponendi, et velut lupi, abigendi sunt per veros pastores a grege dominico, si sunt incurabiles."(1).

With regard to Berne, the State took upon itself much more authority over the Ministry. When the City Council passed and authorised the Acts of the Synod, in 1532, it adopted a rather high tone towards the ministers- "Cependant comme vous jugé vous-mêmes, que c'est une action chrétienne, nous n'userons point de connivence envers vous, et nous ne vous laisserons point impunis si quelq'un de vous n'enseigne pas d'une manière convenable à la gloire de Dieu et à la nature de l'esprit, et édifiante, mais prononce des paroles injurieuses propres ~~détruire~~ détruire----"(2). We hear also of this Council taking upon itself the appointing of ministers in an irregular manner. The rule would be that those intended to be placed in charges would first be examined as to their fitness. Ruchat mentions one case where the Council chose four pastors for charges in the Canton Vaud before ever they had been examined, and afterwards sent them to Farel and another minister to be examined. Such irregularities, no doubt, belonged to the beginnings of the Reformed Church in the Cantons of Berne and Vaud, and even the autocratic Council of Berne would not indulge in the same later on. As Ruchat remarks- "Il semble que l'examen eût dû précéder la confirmation. Mais alors les choses n'étaient point encore

(1) Niemeyer. p.512.

(2) Ruchat. Vol.III. p.526.

VI. Control.

bien réglées."(1). Yet it looks as if the Berne Council had purposed to keep a close control of the Ministry, for when it issued an Edict of Reformation for the Canton de Vaud in 1536, it ordained- "Premierement, que nul soi mêle d'annoncer la Parole de Dieu en nos dits pays que (qui) ne soit par nous à ce député. Toutefois l'élection des dits ministres se pourra faire par les prédicans et iceux à nous présentés pour les confirmer."⁽²⁾

In 1542 the Council was even directing the ministers of the Canton Vaud how they were to celebrate the Lord's Supper. Calvin wrote remonstrating against this in more than one letter, To Viret on the 23rd. Augt., 1542, he wrote- "Il s'agit de peser quel exemple donneront nos frères s'ils reconnaissent le Conseil comme juge de la doctrine, de telle façon qu'ils devront souscrire à tout ce qu'il aura décidé et à le tenir comme un oracle. Certes, si nous permettons qu'on nous impose ainsi le joug, nous compromettons, par notre dissimulation, le ministère sacré, et jamais nous ne pourrions justifier cette trahison ni devant Dieu ni devant les hommes."(3). Again on another occasion, Calvin, with reason, wrote and expostulated with the ministers of Bern, when the Council of that City was abolishing the weekly conferences of the ministers of the Canton de Vaud in 1549.(4). Bern Council was high-handed in Church matters. Yet even in its dominions, the different districts were allowed to meet in local Synods to exercise some control over their own ministers.(5)

(1) Ruchat. Vol.III. pp.536-538.

(2) Kidd. p.556.

(3) Heyer. pp.16,17. Bonnet- Letters. Vol.I. p.322.

(4) Bonnet. Letters. Vol.II. p.237, and footnote.

(5) Ruchat. Vol.II. p.46.

VI. Control.

In Geneva the two Church bodies which could deal with the Ministry were the Venerable Company and the Consistory, not so much the latter. The former was made up of the Ministers and the Theological Professors, the latter had on it both ministers and laymen. It only dealt with the Ministry in disciplinary cases. The former had the ordinary control. Owing to the commanding influence of Calvin, these two bodies could act with considerable independence of the State in the way of ~~directing~~ directing ministers, and of Church censures. Yet the final word had always to be spoken by the City Council, and it was the authority which had the power of deposing ministers.(1).

It may seem to us that the Ministry in the Reformed Churches of the Swiss Cantons was too much under the secular authority. We have to remember that these town and cantonal authorities of the Reformation times in Switzerland were not like the public authorities of our day, which are made up of all and sundry, churchmen and non-churchmen, religious and irreligious, believers and atheists. The members of the Councils were all professed members of the Church, and had a strong interest in religion, and in the Reformation Movement. If the cantonal churches could be called state churches, the cantons themselves could be called church-states. This was perhaps particularly the case as regards Geneva in Calvin's and Beza's time. And in the case of Bern, its Council had a zeal for religion. It directed its efforts for the furtherance of a true reformation in the Church. The ministers being subject to its authority, in spite of it being somewhat arbitrary, could feel that they were

(1) Heyer. pp.26,27.

VI. Control.

not under an alien control, but one which in the great matters of Religion and Reformation was one with themselves. When confirming and authorising the Acts of the Synod of Bern, 1532, the Council of the City stated to the ministers that it was going to sustain and protect them- "Afin que vous puissiez prêcher Jésus-Christ seul, rejeter les erreurs, attaquer et combattre sans crainte les vices et les scandales, tant des seigneurs et des magistrats, que des sujets, et même les nôtres, selon l'ordre de la foi, de la charité, et autant que les auditeurs en pourront être édifiés en Dieu."(1).

When we come to consider the controls over the Ministry in the French Church, we are looking at a Reformed Church affected by very different conditions from those of the Swiss ~~Church~~ Churches. It is in a land of which the Rulers along with the Papal Church are hostile to it. It cannot rely upon the secular powers for anything. It must be autonomous, and the Ministry comes to be under church authorities alone. That does not mean that the Church claimed to be free from the law of the land, or for its Ministry to be legally only under the Church. The Reformed Church in France, as elsewhere in all ~~lands~~ lands where it was being set up, exhorted its people to be loyal to king and civil government, and to live peaceably under the laws. It made no claim for "privilege of clergy", as the Papal Church did, demanding that the clergy should be exempt from subjection to the ordinary processes of ordinary law in the secular

(1) Ruchat. Vol.III. p.526.

VI. Control.

courts, and should be subject only to canon law and ecclesiastical courts. The Reformed Churches did not claim anything of the kind. In the French Discipline it is laid down- "The duty of ministers is to govern both themselves and all their members, great or lowly, according to the Word of God, and by ecclesiastical Discipline; but it pertains also to the Civil Magistrate to watch over all sorts and conditions of men, ministers included, and to see that they walk uprightly in their callings. The Magistrate, if they come short, is to send notice to Consistories, Colloquies, and Synods, regarding their duty, by reference to the Ecclesiastical Discipline - unless the faults are such as are punishable by law, and thus fall to be dealt with by the magistrate."(1). The views of George Gillespie on this point may be taken as typical of Reformed Churchmen- "We grant that pastors and elders, whether they be considered distributively, or collectively in presbyteries and synods, being subjects and members of the commonwealth, ought to be subject and obedient in the Lord to the magistrate and to the law of the land; and in all other duties, so in civil subjection and obedience, they ought to be ensamples to the flock; and their trespasses against law are punishable as much, yea, more, than the trespasses of other subjects."(2). It was with regard to church matters, ministerial duties, theology and teaching, right conduct above what was demanded by the civil law, that the Ministry had to be subject to the church authorities. So it was in the French Church. Ministers were subject to the Church authorities with respect to all that

(1) Campbell. I.46. pp.9,10

(2) Gillespie. "Aaron's Rod Blossoming". p.85.

VI. Control.

belonged to the ministerial office, and more or less to all the church courts. These were the Consistory (Kirk Session), the Colloquy (Presbytery), the Provincial Synod (Synod), and the National Synod (General Assembly), in ascending scale. A minister was more or less subject to all these courts. And the records of the National Synods show that they used their authority for compelling ministers to attendance at ~~the~~ the meetings of Colloquies and Provincial Synods (1), ~~of~~ for directing the preaching (2), for prescribing the kind of dress to be worn by ministers and their wives and families (3), and such personal matters, as well as the main matters of keeping control over the morals and doctrine of the ministers. It is to be noted that a minister in some degree was subject to his consistory (kirk session), though of course always with the protection of the higher courts. So we read in the "Discipline"- "If a minister is convicted of monstrous and notorious crimes, he shall be promptly deposed by the Consistory, which is to call in the Colloquy (Presbytery), or, failing that, two or three pastors who are beyond suspicion. In case the delinquent minister should complain of false witnesses and calumny, this fact shall be reported to the Provincial Synod; if he has preached heretical doctrine, he shall be promptly suspended by the Consistory, the Colloquy, or two or ~~three~~ three ministers called for the purpose, as above; until such time when the Provincial Synod gives final judgment; and all sentences of suspension, from

(1) Synodicon. Vol.I. p.120.

(2) Do. Vol.I. p.115. Vol.II. p.11.

(3) Do. Vol.I. p.249.

VI. Control.

whatever causes, shall be held to admit of appeal, until the case be ended."(1). Unhappily, in those troubled times of injustice, oppression, and persecution, for the French Church, when unsuitable men could creep into the ministry and prove utterly unworthy, and still more men, owing to the persecutions and the poverty, become unfaithful, the governing over the ministry shows itself strict and severe. At the conclusions of the reports of the National Synods (vide "Synodicon"), lists are given of deposed ministers. These lists reveal how watchful the church authorities had to be to weed out vicious, and lazy, and apostatizing men, from the ministry.

Among the Reformed Churchmen in England of the Elizabethan period, there were proposals for much the same manner of control over the Ministry. At that time they remained no more than proposals. But they were there, although perhaps rather vague and insufficiently worked out in detail. Because they could not be put into practice, they lacked the testings of practice, But they have importance as showing what was being worked for in England. In the "Directory" drafted by Travers and Cartwright, 1574, it is advocated that the power of discipline and excommunication be exercised by the "Common Counsell of the Eldership"(probably a kind of Kirk Session), and that ministers be subject to this "Counsell" as well as ordinary members of the church- "They which belong specially to the Ministers of publique charge in the Church, to their calling either to be begun or ended, and ~~ended~~ ended either by relieving or punishing

(1) Campbell. I.50. p.10.

VI. Control.

them, and that for a time by suspension or altogether by deposition ----- yet in all the greater affairs of the church, as in excommunicating of any, and in choosing and deposing of church ministers, nothing may be concluded without the knowledge and consent of the church."(1). And again there are further directions- "They that are to be excommunicated being in publique charge in the Church are to be deposed (apparently by a kind of "Consistory") also from their charges. They also are to be discharged that are unfit for the Ministry by reason of their ignorance, or of some incurable disease ----- When there is question concerning an heritique, complained of to the Consistory, streight let two or three neighbour Ministers be called, men godly and learned, and free from that suspition, by whose opinion he may be suspended till such time as the Conference (possibly a Presbytery) may take knowledge of his cause."(2). The Reformed "Discipline" was accused of being tyrannous, but there is nothing of that in all these regulations, only the effort to do justly and fairly in controlling the ministry aright.

In Scotland the accepted controlling authorities of the Ministry in the earlier stages of the Reformation period varied. Now in dealing with the practice and procedure of the Reformation Church of Scotland from 1560 to 1662, and even up to the Revolution Settlement, there is sometimes not sufficient discriminating between the Church's varying phases in functioning, now as a "Reformed Church" and then under some kind of

(1) Briggs. Appendix I. p.iii

(2) Do. Do. pp. xi,xii.

VI. Control.

prelacy, and this leads to confusion and unreliable conclusions. It may be a little difficult at times to disentangle the two kinds of functioning, but here the endeavour will be made to deal only with what were the controlling authorities when the Scottish Church was functioning as a "Reformed Church" and not as prelatic.

For a beginning we simply notice that the first ministers, when the Reformed Church was instituted in 1560, were stationed in their charges by the secular authorities. "Commissioners of burghes, with some of the nobilitie and barons, were appointed to see ministers placed, who for the time were in Edinburgh for the most part. Mr Knox was appointed minister in Edinburgh &c. &c, --"(1). It might have been thought that the Reformed Church in Scotland ^{was} ~~were~~ beginning to have as close a connection with the State as the Reformed Churches of Switzerland, and that the ministers would be partly under the State and partly under the church authority. But conditions in Scotland were to turn out very different from those of Switzerland. Soon after the instituting of the Reformed Church a Roman Catholic queen came in, and after her rule was ended, except for the Regent Moray, the Regents and the Kings were not the friends of the Reformed Church. Its position was not as ~~bad~~ bad as that of the Reformed Church of France. It had not as fierce enemies, and as powerful, to maintain itself in the face of. Yet there was the ^{nearly} constant opposition of the powers-that-be to it, and an intriguing both within and without it to overcome

(1) Calderwood. Vol.II. p.11.

VI. Control.

it as a Reformed Church and make it into something different. So if the Church of Scotland Church was to be a Reformed Church, it must stand independent of the secular authorities, for it could expect no real and sympathetic favour from them. It must seek to be autonomous as far as possible. It did indeed make the claim on the secular powers that rightly its interests ought to be furthered by them, but often its claim was disregarded. It had to take up a more or less independent position as regards the State. Its ministers were brought up to understand that with regard to religious and moral, ecclesiastical and theological matters, they were ^{to be} under church authorities. The General Assembly was always to be the supreme authority for them in the Church. And the Assembly acted according to that view. It exercised the supreme authority. It had power to admit men to the Ministry, to place men in charges, to transfer ministers from one charge to another, to correct any for neglect of duty or defections from moral uprightness, to judge the competence or orthodoxy of ministers, to excommunicate or to suspend or to depose from the ministry those who were proved guilty of serious faults. Under the Assembly there were ~~the~~ other authorities. Some of these ceased to have control of ministers when the Church became more completely organized and developed. At first ministers were placed partly under the control of their Kirk Sessions. The First Book of Discipline enacts this-"Yea, the Seniouris aught to tak heyde to the life, manneris, deligence, and studye of thair Ministeris. Yf he be worthie of admonitioun, thei must admonische him; of correctioun,

VI. Control

thei must correct him: And yf he be worthy of depositioun, they with consent of the Churche and Superintendent may depose him, so that his cryme so deserve. Yf a Minister be licht in conversation, by his Elderis and Seniouris, he aught to be admonished. Yf he be negligent in studie, or one that vaketh not upon his charge and flocke, or one that proponeth not frutefull doctrine, he deservith scharper admonitioun and correctioun. To the whiche yf he be fund stubburne and inobedient, then may the Seniouris of one Churche complaine to the Ministerie of the two nixt adjacent churcheis, whaire men of greater gravitie are: to whois admonitioun yf he be fund inobedient, he aught to be discharged frome his ministerie till his repentance appeare, and a place be vaking for him."(1). This recommendation, if it may so be called, sets forth what is to be the authority of a Kirk Session over its minister, and also other authorities which there may be. The Superintendent is mentioned, and the "Church", which means here the congregation concerned; and there is mention of the "Ministerie of the two nixt adjacent churcheis", which means not only the ministers but the kirk-sessions of those two kind of churches. This was the composition of the local authority over a minister before Presbyteries were set up. The above extract also shows for what causes discipline or control was to be exercised over ministers.

These authorities did not continue. As we have seen, Superintendents passed away. The "adjacent churcheis" became merged in Presbyteries. And the authority of a kirk-session over

(1) Laing's Knox. Vol.II. p.235.

VI. Control.

its minister did not last. One of the Questions which James VI put forward to be considered by the Perth Convention of 1597 was- "Is not his session judge to his (the minister's) doctrine?" Calderwood relates the replies given by the Synod of Fife, by the minister, Galloway, and by "Another Brother". The Synod of Fife replied- "The Word of God, and exponents thereof, the pastors and doctors, are onlie judge of his doctrine: The spirit of the propheits is subject to the propheits, I Cor. XIV." Galloway replied very bluntly with only one word- "Nocht". "Another Brother" replied- "Blind men should not judge colours. Paul says, that the elder that is occupied in the Word is worthy of double honour; signifying that all elders cannot teach. If then unapt to teach, unapt to judge of doctrine--- The ⁽¹⁾₂₂ spirit of the propheits is subject to the propheits- I. Cor. XIV~~22~~²². It looks as if that authority of the kirk-session over the minister had not proved very suitable or acceptable, and there would be nothing surprising in that. If we may go interestingly out of our way, and slightly out of our period, we may quote some other much later official word on the abolishing of the Session's authority over the minister, which clinched the matter for the future. In "The Form of Process" of 1707, it is laid down- "The minister of the word, being an office above that of the ruling elder, cannot be liable to the censure of the kirk-session, but to the superior judicatories of the Church." (2). And again- "All processes against any minister, are to begin before the presbytery, to which he belongeth, and not before the kirk session of his own parish." (3)

(1) Calderwood. Vol. V. PP. 588, 597, 601. (2) "Form" I. 7. (3) VII. 1.

VI. Control.

When the Church had become fully organized with Presbyteries these courts superseded all other authorities^{over the ministry}, except those of the higher courts. And to go further forward, the Westminster Assembly confirmed for the Scottish Church its presbyterial government. As for England, it may be added, the Assembly gave a partial and temporary presbyterial government, and an ideal.

There is now one most important matter in the subject of the authority over the Ministry which lastly must be taken up. The authority of the Pope had been cast off, which had been supreme over every man of all ranks in the Ministerial Order of the Mediaeval Church. That authority was not cast off to substitute for it nothing but church courts or some secular power. The Pope had usurped the Headship of the Church, and in casting him off, the supreme Headship of Christ over the Church and its Ministry was reaffirmed. This we find definitely stated in Reformed Confessions, in one form or another, that Christ is the only universal Bishop of His Church, or that He is the only Head and King of the Church. So ~~affirm~~ affirm the First and Second Helvetic Confessions, so the French and Belgic Confessions, so the Scottish Confession of 1560 and the Second Book of Discipline; and last of all may be mentioned the Westminster Confession of Faith, which is very clear in its statement with the words- "There is no other head of the church but the Lord Jesus Christ."⁽¹⁾ The leaders, also, of the Reformed Churches in all the countries upheld this same doctrine of the

(1) Confession. XXV.6.

VI. Control.

Headship of Christ in His Church, but to name, Calvin, Knox, Cartwright, Andrew and James Melville.

Calvin sets down in the "Institutes" his persuasion in the matter- "Her (the Church's) only Head is Christ, under whose government we are all united to each other, according to that order and form of policy which he himself has prescribed. Wherefore they offer an egregious insult to Christ, when under this pretext, they would have one man to preside over the whole Church, seeing the Church can never be without a head,"even Christ, from whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body - Eph.IV.15,16. -----I am not unaware of the cavilling objection which they are wont to urge, viz. that Christ is properly called the only Head,because He alone reigns by His own authority and in His own name; but there is nothing in this to prevent what they call another"ministerial" head from being under Him, and acting as His substitute. But this cavil cannot avail them until they previously show that this office was ordained by Christ."(1).

Now, as Christ was declared to be Head of the Church, it followed of necessity that He must be Head of the Ministry, the Sender forth of all those who enter truly into the Ministry, and the Guider and Controller of all. In some of the Confessions we can notice this is made out. In the French Confession we have it- "Nous croyons tous vrais pasteurs, en
(1) Calvin. Inst. Bk.IV. Chap.VI.9.

VI. Control.

quelque lieu qu'ils soyent, avoir mesme autorité ^{et} égale ~~pp/ssa~~ puissance sous un seul chef, seul souverain, et seul universel Evesque Jésus Christ."(1). The Belgic Confession likewise connects the Ministry with the Headship of Christ- "As for the Ministers of God's Word ----- as they are all ministers of Christ, the only universal Bishop, and the only Head of the Church."(2). This was the great and supreme authority over the Order of the Ministry, above all secular authorities, above all church courts- the Lord Jesus Christ. The ministers of the Genevan Church, before being placed in their charges, had to make a solemn promise, among ~~other~~ other things, to keep and maintain the honour of the Magistracy of the City, and to be subject to the polity and statutes of the City. But there was the reservation- "C'est-a-dire sans prejudicier à la liberté que nous devons avoir d'enseigner selon que Dieu nous le commande et faire les choses qui sont de notre office. Et, enfin, je promets de servir tellement à la Seigneurie et au peuple, que par cela je ne sois nullement empêché de rendre à Dieu le service que je ~~dois~~ lui dois en ma vocation."(3). This reservation was sufficient to provide the liberty for the recognition of the Headship of Christ. That was the freedom which the faithful of the Reformed Ministers always claimed. Whatever other authorities they might be under, there was always the reservation that the first and chief obedience must be rendered to Christ in the Church. This was not a mere theory, or inoperative doctrine or principle, it became at times the guiding conviction to direct

(1) Kidd. p.670.

(2) Schaff- Creeds . Belgic Conf. XXXI.; Niemeyer. p.382.

(3) Meyer. p.276.

VI. Control.

practice and procedure even in face of contrary authorities. Christ was to be ^{the Head} of the ministers to direct how they would arrange the ceremonies of the Church, how the preaching. He was to be the supreme Head that if any other authorities conflicted with His, it was His that had to be obeyed. One might give a number of examples of the practical application of the doctrine of the Headship of Christ over the activities of the Ministry. We will take one, that of Robert Bruce, the earnest and devoted minister in Edinburgh when James VI was king. "On the 25th. June, (1602) the King called him to Perth, and after Sir Patrick Murray had produced the articles, the king asked Mr. Bruce, if he was willing to preach according to them. The other (Bruce) answered, No; because preaching was his instructions and commission, and no prince hath power to give instructions to another prince's ambassador; and said, he was Christ's ambassador in preaching."(1). Whenever Reformed ministers took a stand of this kind, they were acting in accordance with an essential principle of the Reformed Ministerial Order, that Christ was the supreme authority over it, and over each of them, since He was the one and only Head of the Church.

It ought to be a noble Ministerial Order which ^{finds its} ~~has the~~ supreme controlling authority in Christ. The Reformed Order may not always have lived up to it. It probably only at times came near doing so. But as a doctrine for the Christian Ministry, it provides the very highest ideals and incentives for that Ministry. And it certainly was the doctrine which was

(1) Wodrow's Life of Bruce, p.109.

VI. Control.

of set purpose connected with the Reformed Order, to be of Christ and under Christ. "Dann Christus selbst allein das waar und recht hopt und hirt seiner Kilchen ist, der selbig gibt siner Kilchen, hirten und leerer."(1). The matter is very well stated by a quotation which Von Hoffmann makes from the "Politia," an influential document arising in the Reformed Church of the Netherlands in 1585. "Das anonyme Buch "De Politia &c." sagt: "Er ist der alleinige Konig der Kirche", der rex "penes quem totius Ecclesiae est summum ius et summum imperium"- Auch von dem lutherischen Protestantismus wird Christus als Haupt seiner Kirche bezeichnet, damit ist dann aber zunächst unsichtbare gemeint. In der reformierten Kirche und demnach auch hier bedeuten diese Ausdrücke etwas Anderes. Christus ist der alleinige unmittelbare Herrscher in der sichtbaren wie in der unsichtbaren Kirche, oder wie die Politia sich ausdrückt: "Christus est ille qui redemit Ecclesiam, qui lauit, qui gubernat intus per Spiritum suum, et foris per ministerium vel politiam quam ipse constituit.""(2).

(1) First Helvetic Conf. XVIII. Niemeyer. p.110.

(2) Von Hoffmann. p.88.

VII. Admission to the Reformed Church Ministerial Order.

In the Reformed Churches there was such a high ideal for the Ministerial Order, that we would expect that the greatest care would be exercised over the admissions to it. And yet the leaders had inducements to be lax. The right men were not always to be easily had. This was especially so in the earlier years of the Reformation. In Geneva at the beginning, it may be noticed, suitable men were not certain to be forthcoming. Calvin, in a letter to Viret written in 1542, expresses his ~~an~~ anxiety about the new ministers- " Our Colleagues make considerable progress in preaching; but in two of them there is, I fear, somewhat of vainglory. You understand who the other person, the third, is; in my opinion he evinces a better regulated judgment. Peter has, besides, shewn already some tendencies which are not very satisfactory, if what Geniston has reported to me be indeed true. As, however, we have not yet ascertained the point with sufficient certainty, I have resolved to observe him more closely. If we have been deceived by him, where is faith to be found ? Louis, as I always feared, has more of levity and less of self control in his conversation and behaviour than becomes a minister of the Gospel; but this defect, as I hope, will in course of time, be corrected, if only the other more essential qualifications are not found wanting."⁽¹⁾

We can with this almost enter into the feelings of Calvin in the cares and anxieties he had over the ministers. But if in

(1) Calvin. Lett. Vol.I. p.318.

VII. Admission.

the small constituency of the City and Canton of Geneva there were difficulties in obtaining a sufficient number of suitable men as ministers, much more so was it the case in bigger constituencies like France and Scotland. The Church of Scotland with rather more than one thousand parishes at the time, had at the first after the Reformation, only about thirteen ministers including the superintendents. It was a wonder the church leaders, in such circumstances, were not inclined to accept anybody and everybody for the ministry. And yet they were not.

It was emphasised in the Confessions and by leaders in the Churches that no man had to thrust himself into the Ministry, nor were any to thrust others in. What was required was a "call", and unless a man had that, he had no right to be in the Ministry. Zwingli had pronounced something like this in his Article on the Preaching-Office. If one can understand his old Swiss-German, his views are stated in the following extract, for which happily, in the interpreting of it, the editor of his Works has given some little help- "Diser Ampteren aller samenn hat sich nye gheyn frommer Christ für sich selbs angenommen (alle diese Amten zusammen hat nie ein frommer Christ sich selber angeeignet), sunder erst, so er von gott gesandt ist worden oder von den kilchen oder apostlen erwellet (erwahlt), das ouch nûts (nichts) anders ist denn ein berüffung und sendung."(1). Calvin adhered to the same views- "Wherefore lest restless and turbulent men should presumptuously push themselves forward to teach or rule, (an event which actually

(1) Zwinglis Sämtliche Werke. Vol.IV. p.425.

VII. Admission.

was to happen,) it was expressly ~~stated~~ provided that no one should assume a public office in the Church without a call."(1) The Genevan "Ordonnances" of 1541 stated the same principle- "Or afin que rien ne se fasse confusément en l'Eglise, nul ~~ne~~ (ne) se doit ~~ingérer~~ ingérer en cet office sans vocation;"(2) and this is practically repeated in the "Ordonnances" of 1576.

It may be well to look at ^{some of the leading} ~~different~~ statements of the same kind in different countries. The French Confession sets forth in Article XXXI- "Nous croyons que nul ne se doit ingérer de son autorité propre pour gouverner l'Eglise; mais que cela se doit faire par élection, en tant qu'il est possible, et que Dieu le permet."(3). The Scottish First Book of Discipline has-"In a Kirk reformed or tending to reformation, none ought (to) presume either to preach, either yet to minister the Sacraments, till that ordourlie thair be callit to the same."(4). With more details the Second Helvetic Confession speaks- "Nemo autem honorem ministerii ecclesiastici usurpare sibi, id est, ad se largitionibus, aut ullis artibus, aut arbitrio proprio, rapere debet. Vocentur et eligantur electione ecclesiastica et legitima ministri ecclesiae: id est, eligantur religiose ab ecclesia, vel ad hoc deputatis ab ecclesia, ordine iusto, et absque turba, seditionibus, et contentione. ----- Damnamus ~~hic omnes~~ hic omnes qui sua sponte currunt, cum non sint electi, ~~missi, vel ordinati.~~"(5). And the English "Directory", by

(1) Calvin. Inst. Bk.IV. Chap.II.10.

(2) Meyer. p.262.

(3) Kidd. p.670.

(4) Laing's Knox. Vol.II. p.189.

(5) Niemeyer. pp. 507, & 508.

VII. Admission.

Travers and Cartwright, plainly urges what must be the right rule- "Let no man thrust himselfe into the executing of any publique charge in the administration of the Word, Sacraments, Discipline, or care over the poore. Neither let any such sue or seek for any publique charge of the Church, but let every one tarry till hee be lawfully called."(1). For a later declaration of the same kind, we have the words in the "Form of Church Government" of the Westminster Assembly repeated more than once- "No man ought to take upon him the office of a minister of the word without a lawful calling."(2). And a somewhat later English authority has it- "Indeed gifts are a necessary qualification of the person to be called, but make him not a lawful minister till called and ordained: And if he take the office upon him unsent, he is an Usurper, and may fear to perish in the gainsaying of Corah, notwithstanding his gifts."(3). This declaration is made in opposition to the claim, often made in those days by Independents and all kinds, soldiers in Cromwell's army and others, that anybody with "gifts", i.e. with some ability to preach, might act as in the ministry.

It is very plain that for the admission to the Reformed Ministry, the "Call" was considered most important, in fact, essential. What was ~~not~~ meant by it ? It was not exactly what we mean in our modern use of the word when we talk about a "call" from a ministerless congregation in order to fill up the vacancy. It would no doubt include such as that, but it had a more comprehensive use. Calvin takes upon him in the

(1) Briggs. Appendix I. p.iv.

(2) Westminster "Form of Church Government". p.586.

(3) "Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici." p.74.

VII. Admission.

"Institutes" to explain what is included in the term- "Therefore, if anyone would be deemed a true minister of the Church, he must first be duly called; and, secondly, he must answer to his calling-- ----- But as we have already touched on the necessity of executing the office, let us now treat only of the call. The subject is comprehended under four heads, viz. who are to be appointed ministers, in what way, by whom, and with what rite or initiatory ceremony. I am speaking of the external and formal call which relates to the public order of the Church, while I say nothing of that secret call of which any minister is conscious before God, but has not the Church as a witness of."(1). We can get from that an inkling of what Calvin has in his mind when he uses the word call in an ecclesiastical sense, and his idea of it was the commonly accepted one. It is not the inner call of God to the ministry, though that will be presupposed, but it is an outer public mode of admitting a man into the ministry, which is meant. More explicit definitions of what the "call" is are found, and there is one in the Scottish First Book of Discipline- "Ordinarie vocation (the "call") consisteth in Election, Examination, and Admission."(2). We can gather from these and like statements, that what was meant by the "call" was that which went to make up the whole procedure in the public authorising of a man to be in the Ministry. This public authorising was an essential of the rightful ministry. It is one of the doctrines of the Reformed Churches regarding

(1) Calvin. Inst. Bk.IV. Chap.III 10,11.

(2) Laing's Knox. Vol.II. p.189.

VII. Admission.

the true ministry, it must have this "call", it must have this public procedure towards a proper authorising. We were noticing that it was the Reformed Church doctrine that there is no true ministry which is not a preaching ministry. Preaching is a constituent essential of the true Ministerial Order. Just as much, this public procedure of authorisation for the ministry, is essential. The one belongs to the essential nature of the ministry, the other belongs to the essential making of the ministry. It will be necessary to notice something of this again when dealing with the subject of the validity of the Ministry.

The procedure in the public authorising of men for the Ministry contains several elements. In the passages quoted above there was set forth in outline what the procedure was to be. It may be as well to mention the elements in rather fuller detail. The procedure was to include, selection of candidates, ~~actual/election~~ trial or examination of the fitness of candidates, actual election of a candidate by the people or others, solemn installation of the candidate in the Ministry. All these elements were in some way to enter into the public authorising for the Ministry, making up the "call" in its entirety. They need not all be distinct and separate, and in practice were generally not so. They would often be combined, as, for example, examination as to fitness and selecting could take place at the same time; or the selecting and electing might be a combined operation; and the electing in part could have its place at the solemn installation, for the people might be asked for their assent then, and the examination had its part also then, for candidates were asked some questions. The order

VII. Admission.

too, of the procedure did not need to be in all respects always the same, for candidates might be tried and examined first as to fitness, and selected or elected afterwards; or selected to be candidates first, and then tried as to their fitness before proceeding any further. The two most important elements in the matter would be election and solemn installation.

The admitting to the Ministry in ~~part~~ particular cases was dependent more or less on their being a vacant charge. Of course "trials" or "examination" of candidates could be held in view of possible vacant charges, but part of the procedure belonging to the "call", such as the vows, promises, answers to certain questions, and the actual installation, could only be when there was a vacant charge to which the candidate had been elected.

Now this became one of the principles of most of the Reformed Churches, that admissions to the ministry should only take place when there were vacancies to be filled up. The Reformed Churches generally were against admissions "at large." They considered that this practice had produced great evils in the Mediaeval Church, in which men had been admitted to the priesthood without having any certain or definite charge as priests to enter on. One may just notice that the Lutheran Churches upheld this same principle as the Reformed,⁽¹⁾ while the Elizabethan English Church did not. Even where the principle is not stated in the official directions of Reformed Churches, it is generally acted upon, and admissions are in view of vacant charges or some particular present needs. ~~Chap-~~

(1) Lutheran Cyclopaedia.

VII. Admission.

Chaplains, indeed, we hear of being engaged for duties in the households of the nobility both in France and Scotland. James VI, of Scotland, was provided with a chaplain. These engagements, however, would be looked on as charges. The French Church Discipline is quite ^{decided} about the general principle- "Ministers cannot be elected without being assigned to a particular charge, and they shall belong to the flock which has been entrusted to their care,"(1). The Scottish Second Book of Discipline lays down- "They that are called unto the Ministrie, or that offer themselves thereunto, aucht not to be electit without ane flock certain Flock be assignit unto them."(2). On this whole question, the English Reformed Churchmen of Elizabethan times were specially strong, which may have been because of what they saw as the result of ~~what they saw~~ the practices of Elizabeth's prelates. The dominant Church authorities followed a looser plan, and did admit and send forth ordained men "at large". Udall writes against that in his "Demonstration of Discipline" and refers to both Cartwright and Whitgift, agreeing with the first and disagreeing with the second- "No man may be ordained unto any office in the Church, untill there be such a place void as he is fit for. T.C. (Thomas Cartwright), I booke, page 61. They thinke otherwise, as their making of so many ministers at once proveth, and as is holden, Whitgift, page 222."(3). More authoritative from English Reformed Churchmen is the enactment in the "Directory" of Travers and Cartwright- "Let none be called but

(1) Campbell. I.10. p.3.

(2) Dunlop. Vol.II. p.770.

(3) Udall- "A Demonstration &c." p.17.

VII. Admission.

unto one certain charge ordained of God, and to the exercising of the same in some particular congregation."(1). There are other English Reformed documents with the same recommendations.(2).

In later times, among the charges brought against the Scottish prelates by the Glasgow Assembly of 1638, was this, that contrary to the "book of Policie" (Second Book of Discipline, they had been ordaining "at large," and that they themselves had not been "tied to particular flockes".(3).

The Westminster Assembly dealt with this matter of no admission to the ministry "at large". It debated the question in March, 1644. Calamy brought forward some keen objections to the proposition "that no ordination is to be given except to a particular congregation or other ministerial charge", suggesting, among other things, perhaps not quite reasonably, that this would prevent men being set aside for missionary work. His objections, however, were of the thoughtful kind which it was well should be brought forward and considered. The Assembly in the end decided- "It is agreeable to the word of God, and very expedient, that such as are to be ordained ministers, be designed to some particular church, or other ministerial charge."(4).—This was a definite position without being too rigid and unbending. One of the characteristics of the Westminster Assembly was the eminent reasonableness of the great majority of the members, a notable characteristic

(1) Briggs. Append.I. pp.iv,v.

(2) "Seconde Parte of a Register". Vol.I. pp.167,258.

(3) Peterkin. pp.96,97.

(4) Lightfoot. pp.218-228. Gillespie. pp.42-45.

Westminster Assembly- "Form of Church Government."

VII. Admission.

for those days.

Although ~~this~~ this, that men should only be admitted to the ministry with definite charges in view, was the generally accepted principle and practice, it was not practised without exception in the Reformed Churches. It appears that the Swiss Churches did not adhere strictly to the principle. Ruchat says, speaking of Zurich- "Et comme on suit à Zúrich le même usage qui est établi pour toute la Suisse réformée, de donner l'imposition des mains et le caractère de ministre aux proposans, sans leur donner aucune Eglise à servir - usage en quoi l'on se trouve différent des Eglises de France et des Pays-Bas, qui ont retenu à cet égard la discipline de l'ancienne Eglise--".(1). Ruchat only mentions France and Holland, when he might have mentioned also the churches of other countries, Scotland among them. He is not right in saying the churches of these countries followed the discipline of the ancient church. As we have noticed, the Mediaeval Church ordained men to the priesthood "at large". And his statement about the Swiss Churches needs, perhaps, some qualifications. It has to be remembered that Swiss Churches did much in the way of providing ministers to serve in countries where the Reformed Movement was in a struggling condition. Young men trained in Swiss theological academies were sent forth where it would be uncertain if there would be ~~church~~ church authorities to ordain them, and it would be natural and almost necessary for them to be ordained before they went forth. Of ministers kept at home, perhaps there is

(1) Ruchat. Vol.II. p.44.

VII. Admission.

no reason to think there were very many ordained without charges; theological professors could not be thought to be such. In Geneva and its Canton there do not appear to have been ~~any~~ too many ordained ministers, for there seems to have been the custom to use students and proposans (probationers) to preach and even dispense the sacraments in village churches, which ~~they~~ would not have been the case if there had been an excess of ordained men going about without definite duties. The French National Assemblies of 1603 and 1607 sent appeals to the Genevan Church authorities not ^{to} send their students, who were studying in Geneva, to do such ministerial work, as it was against the rules of their Church. ⁽¹⁾ As to how it was, and has been, with respect to ordinations without charge in Geneva, no doubt the brief summary of Meyer can be trusted- "Au XVI et encore au XVII siècle, les candidats en théologie étaient examinés au point de vue de leurs aptitudes et de leur doctrine, puis consacrés, au moment où un poste se présentait pour eux. Plus tard la consécration suivit immédiatement la fin des études. Ces ministres, qu'on désignait au XVIII siècle sous le nom d'Envoyés, étaient généralement prêtés ou envoyés aux Églises françaises dépourvues de pasteurs, ou bien ils desservaient les Eglises du Refuge, et beaucoup firent ainsi leur carrière au dehors. Plusieurs aussi trouvèrent de l'occupation à Genève dans l'enseignement (~~presque~~) (presque tous les maitres du Collège étaient ministres et il en fut ainsi jusqu'en 1846). Au XVIII siècle, ils furent employés par la Société des Catéchumènes. C'étaient des aides précieux pour les pasteurs en charge,

(1) Synodicon. Vol. I. pp. 231. 26.

VII. Admission.

qui avaient en eux de vrais suffragants. Pendant près d'un siècle et jusqu'au milieu du XIX siècle, ils formèrent un corps des ministres placés sous la direction de la Compagnie."(1).

We turn now to the procedure with regard to "calls" or the public authorising of men for the ministry. The first stage might be the selecting or nominating of candidates. We need not spend much time over this. The nominating or selecting might be by different persons or bodies, patrons or corporations. In Geneva it was the "Company" of ministers which had this duty. Calvin says- "Premièrement: les ministres sont élus par notre compagnie."(2). To take an example from later times, and from Scotland, we find a town council doing the nominating or selecting. In the Council Records of Aberdeen it is narrated that John Row (in 1641) was nominated by the Town Council to be the minister of St. Nicholas', and after approval by the people, was ordained by the Presbytery to the charge.⁽³⁾ All such nominations or selectings may be considered a part of the election.

With regard to the "trial" or examination of candidates, which was to make sure of their fitness for the Ministry, great stress was laid on this in all the Reformed Churches. It was most important to try and ascertain whether the candidate was suitable, morally and spiritually and educationally, or not. All the "Disciplines" provide for that. And the spiritual qualifications would be considered the most important. The Scottish

Second Book of Discipline mentions nothing about an examination

(1) Hoyer. p. 294.

(2) Ruchat. Vol. VI. p. 267. Letter of Calvin to Olivianus, of Heidelberg. Cf. "Ordonnances" Hoyer. pp. 262,

(3) Row's History. Introduction. p. xlii. 279.

VII. Admission.

as to the learning and ability of the candidate, but it does mention this- "The Qualities in generall requisite in all them wha sould beir Charge in the Kirk, consist in Soundnes of Religion, and Godlines of Lyfe, according as they ar sufficiently set furth in the Word."(1). Other "Disciplines" prescribed that the candidate was to preach a sermon or deliver some exposition of Scripture before an audience. Seeing that preaching was so essential in the Ministry, a candidate must show that he had some capability for it. And then learning in some degree was necessary in the Ministry. If a man was going to preach at all worthily, he must have some knowledge, at least of sacred learning. It was not necessary for a priest of the Papal Church to be educated, for his work did not require it. The chief office he had to perform was the offering of the Mass, which was done by means of repeating certain fixed sentences. They were like magical formulae, and could be used quite well even by those who did not understand their meaning. It was not uncommon for priests who recited the Canon of the Mass in the Latin not to know Latin. But ignorance would not do for the preaching minister. It would be a great hindrance to him even if he could make some attempt at ~~it~~ preaching. It would make his sermons of no value, and perhaps positively harmful. He must know the Scriptures, and understand something of Divinity, and if possible have knowledge of Latin and Greek and Hebrew, the last two so as to study the Scriptures better; and also to have some acquaintance with Philosophy, and Logic, and perhaps Mathematics. Of course

(1) Dunlop. Vol.II. p.768.

VII. Admission.

in the early days of the Reformed Churches not so much, speaking generally, was expected from candidates for the Ministry as was expected later on in the way of learning. So it appears to have been in Geneva-"Au début et avant l'établissement de l'Académie, ces examens ne semblent pas avoir été bien difficiles."(1).

"Après la fondation de l'Académie ----- Ils roulent en général sur les langues grecque, latine et hébraïque, sur la morale, sur la philosophie, sur l'explication des textes, sans doute au point de vue de la controverse et de la doctrine."(2). The standards of ministerial learning set up in Geneva became an example and an incentive to other Reformed Churches. The French Discipline expected a good deal from candidates- "A candidate for the ministry shall first be examined by means of exercises from the Word of God, upon texts which shall be prescribed: one in French, as a matter of course, and another in Latin if the Colloquy shall judge this expedient: for each of which exercises he shall be given twenty-four hours in which to prepare. If the Company are satisfied with these, they shall then test his knowledge of Greek by giving him a chapter of the New Testament to translate; and of Hebrew they shall ^{see} to it that he knows at least enough to be able to make use of good books for the better understanding of the Scriptures. To this shall be added an essay of his own on the essentials of philosophy--"(3). When we come to the Westminster Assembly we ~~find~~ find it laying down that the candidate" shall be examined touching his skill in the

(1) - Meyer. p.39.

(2) Do. p.40.

(3) Campbell. I.5. pp.1,2.

VII. Admission.

original tongues, and his trial to be made by reading the Hebrew and Greek Testaments, and rendering some portion of some into Latin -----What authors in divinity he hath read, and is best acquainted with----- and the ecclesiastical history----- He shall also, within a competent time, frame a discourse in Latin, upon such a common-place or controversy in divinity as shall be assigned to him--"(1).

This demand for learning on the part of candidates for the Ministry led to the setting up of Theological Schools in most countries and places where the Reformed Church had been instituted. Zürich, and other Swiss cities had their Divinity Schools. Geneva had its famous Academy. In France there were several academies which became noted, Saumur, Sedan, Montauban. Holland had the new University of Leyden. In England, Cambridge especially seemed to turn out men prepared for the Reformed Church ministry. And in Scotland, the First Book of Discipline included directions for bringing the three old universities up to the needed efficiency for the training of ministers. In 1583 a new university was founded, that of Edinburgh, which at the first was only a Divinity School.

The demand for a ministry trained in Sacred Learning has never ceased in the Reformed Churches. One might almost say that the requirement that ministers should have some learning and education is one of the doctrines concerning the Ministerial Order in these Churches.

When the main "trials" for the ministry were considered satisfactory, the candidate was in a position to be elected to

(1) Westminster Assembly. "Form of Church Government" p.588.

VII. Admission.

a charge. Those to whom the election was to be committed varied under different "Disciplines", and the actual practice, indeed, was not always in accordance with the theory embodied in the church constitutions or politics. There were sometimes hindrances in the carrying out of the regulations as described in the "Disciplines".

In Geneva, the ministers of the "Company" selected the candidates and presented them to the Council, which could accept or reject them. If it accepted, as it always seems to have done, the candidates had to preach before the people to receive their approval, or otherwise. It may be well to have a description of this in Calvin's own words- "Si l'on est content de leur (the candidates) savoir, nous les présentons au conseil avec un témoignage: et il dépend de lui de ne les pas recevoir, s'il ne les trouve pas assez capables. Que s'ils sont reçus;- comme il est toujours arrivé jusqu' `a present- alors nous publions leurs noms devant le peuple, afin que s'ils ont quelque vice qui soit inconnu, chacun puisse le rapporter dans 8 ~~days~~ jours. Ceux qui sont approuvés par les suffrages ^{tacites de} ~~tacites de~~ tous, nous les recommandons à Dieu et à l'Eglise."(1). The ratification of candidates by the Council was also the procedure at Bern.(2). The method followed at Geneva does not seem to have been wholly in accordance with Calvin's ideals. From certain passages in his writings it looks as if he would have given the full electing to the people. ~~In the~~ In the "Institutes" he writes- "The next question is, whether a minister should be chosen by the

(1) Ruchat. Vol.VI. p.567. Letter of Calvin to Olevianus. 1561.

(2) Kidd. p.556. Edict of Bern.

VII. Admissions.

whole Church, or only by colleagues and elders, who have the charge of discipline, or whether they may be appointed by the authority of one individual -----We see, then, that ministers are legitimately called according to the word of God, when those who may seem fit are elected on the consent and approbation of the people. Other pastors, however, ought to preside over the election, lest any error should be committed by the general body, either through levity, or bad passion, or tumult.⁽¹⁾ And in commenting on Acts XIV.23, he says- "Therefore in ordaining pastors the people had their free election; but lest there should be any tumult arise, Paul and Barnabas sit as chief moderators." So, that the people might have a greater part in elections of ministers, may have been a part of Calvin's unrealized ideal at Geneva.

This ideal was probably more fully realized in the French Church. The plan there followed seems to have been for a candidate for a vacancy to first satisfy the Colloquy (or Provincial Synod) of his suitableness for the ministry, and then to be sent to a vacant church, there to preach on three Sundays, to give the people the opportunity of approving or disapproving. Even if the Consistory (Kirk Session) approved of him, he would not be settled at that church against the will of the people.(2).

In the Reformed Church of the Netherlands, all the members of all the churches in a town formed one congregation. This congregation was governed by one Church-Council, and it

(1) Calvin. Inst. Bk.IV. Chap.III.15.

(2) Campbell. I.6. p.2.

VII. Admission.

had the electing of a man to fill any vacancy which might occur in the number of the ministers of the town.(1). English Reformed Churchmen of Elizabeth's reign advocated strongly the election of the minister by the people. Udall concludes-

"Therefore election by the Church (the congregation) is the best, and all other kinds of elections unlawfull."(2). The Reformed Church in Scotland had begun with the theory and practice of the people having a considerable part in the election of their ministers. If John Knox was appointed by certain other authorities to be minister in Edinburgh, ^{yet} according to a small record called, "A Historie of the Estate of Scotland, 1558-1560," he was also elected by the people- "During the tyme (1559) this Congregation of Edenburgh elected and chose John Knox publickly in the Tolbooth of Edenburgh for their minister, the 7th. of July."(3). And that the people should have part in the election was set down in the First Book of Discipline, with certain qualifying clauses- "It apperteyneth to the Pepill, and to everie severall Congregation, to Elect thair Minister; and in caise that thai be fundin negligent thairin the space of fourty dayis, the best reformed kirk, to wit, the church of the Superintendent with his Counsall, ~~may~~ may present unto thame a man quhom thai juge apt to feade the flock of Christ Jesus."(4). The "Discipline" further goes on to lay down that if the Council and the people both choose a man for the vacancy, the choice of the people is to have the preference. But the proposals to

(1) Wicksteed. "Ecclesiastical Institutions of Holland. pp.19,20

(2) Udall. "A Demonstration &c." p.30

(3) Wodrow Miscellany. p.63.

(4) Laing's Knox. Vol.II. p.189.

VII. Admission.

give the people so large a part in elections ^{were} ~~was~~ hardly carried out. Various other authorities stepped in to choose and appoint. The Church was not yet sufficiently trained and organized to properly live up to all its theoretical polity. Sometimes the General Assembly made an appointment. Then there were patrons to put forward their choice. And so long as there were Superintendents, they could choose and put in a man in some cases. Sometimes the people were given the opportunity of agreeing. The Second Book of Discipline dealt with the matter again, and enacted- "In this ordinar Election it is to be eschewit, that na Person be intrusit in ony of the Offices of the Kirk, contrar to the Will of the Congregation to whom they ar appointed, or without the Voce of the Elderschip." (1) This no doubt would have some effect, but no fixed mode of elections was arrived at in those troublous times.

The Westminster Assembly, which drew up regulations to be applicable to England, and to Scotland also so far as the Scottish Assembly agreed thereto, sets forth that ^a candidates shall preach in a vacant church on three Sundays. After this a deputation has to go from the Congregation to the Presbytery to intimate whether they are willing to accept the candidate or not. If they are willing, and there is no further objection, (2) the candidate will be inducted to the charge. About this same time, in Scotland patronage had been abolished, and the General Assembly of 1649 came to this decision about elections, that it

(1) Dunlop. p.768.

(2) Westminster Assembly. "Form of Church Government." p.589.

VII. Admission.

would be for the Kirk Session to elect, and it would put its choice before the people for their acquiescence or rejection.⁽¹⁾

In England, the Provincial Assembly of London, of 1654, warns against a too great importance being assigned to elections by the people- "Now though we do not ~~propose~~ purpose to speak much concerning popular Election, yet because there are many that lift it up too high, and make the whole essence of the Ministeriall Call to consist in it ----- Therefore we are necessitated to propound ----- That the Election of a Minister doth not by divine right belong wholly and solely to the major part of every particular Congregation."(2)

Thus with varying regulations the election of ministers was arranged for in the Reformed Churches ~~from time~~ from time to time. One may notice that it was never lost sight of that the people ought to have some say, greater or less, in the choice of their ministers. This was believed to be in accordance with New Testament teaching and the practice of the early Church.

Once the election of a minister had duly taken place, there only remained in the procedure of the "Call" the formal admission to the Ministry and a solemn setting apart to the Office. In connection with the formal admission and installation in a charge, sometimes a solemn declaration or vow was required from the new entrants. This was notably the case in Geneva.(3).

(1) Peterkin. pp. 550, 551.

(2) "Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici." pp. 126, 127.

(3). Meyer. pp. 275, 276. 315.

Cf. Von Hoffmann for the Netherlands Ch. p. 115.

Wicksteed for Do. p. 16.

Calderwood. Vol. III. for Scotland. p. 2.

VIII. The Solemn Setting Apart,
or, the Ordination.

In the Reformed Churches, which were averse to all unnecessary or unscriptural ceremony in public worship or other ecclesiastical acts, the entrance of the approved candidates into ~~the~~ the regular Order of the Ministry had to be with the observance of some form and ceremony. Those coming forward for the Ministry had to be solemnly set apart for their most important office. We speak of this solemn setting apart as Ordination, ~~which/as~~ which, as we have seen, was a part of the ~~the~~ "call". Of its importance in comparison with other parts of the "call", different Reformed Churchmen would have varying opinions. However, thinking of the "call" as being the procedure in the public admitting to, and authorising of men for, the Ministry, and emphasising the word "public", certainly no part of the procedure was more public than the solemn setting apart or ordination. And in its carrying out it was made to include a little of both "the trials" and the election, for candidates were anew asked questions which could be looked on as belonging to the "trials", and also the assent of the people was anew called for, which, although it might be largely formal, was yet a part of the election. So in the setting apart or ordination ceremony all the essential elements of that "call" were present, of that "call" which according to Reformed Church teaching was absolutely necessary for one ^{who would} ~~in order to~~ enter the Ministerial Order, and ^{without} without which no man had a right to be in the Ministry.

If ordinations in the Scottish Church may be taken as

VIII. Ordination.

illustrations of what the ceremony of admitting men to the Ministry of the Reformed Churches was like, we have Scottish records which can give us some very interesting descriptions. Let us take an early one and a later one. The Early one is to be found in "The Forme and Ordour of the Electioun of the Superintendents &c" of 1560 (1561). This Form was not to be used for the Admission of Superintendents^{only} but also of "all uther Ministers", and was so used, we may suppose, during many years. The edition of it which we have gives us a picture of the admission of John Spottiswood- "First was made a sermon ----- The sermon being finished, it was declared by the same minister, maker thereof, that the Lords of Secrete Councill had given charge and power to the Kirkis of Lauthiane, to chuse Mr. John Spottiswode Superintendent ----- the Minister demanded, Gif ony man knew ony cryme or offence to the said Mr. Johne ----- The pepill wer asked, If they wald have the said Mr. Johne Superintendent ---". Questions were then asked of the candidate regarding his motives in seeking to enter the Ministry, and also as regards his beliefs. Then came the question- a very affecting one- "Becaus ye are a man compassed with infirmities, will ye not charitably, and with lawlines of spirit, receave admonitioun of your Brethrein ? And if ye sall happin to slyde, or offend in in ony point, will ye not be subject to the Discipline of the Kirk, as the rest of your Brethrein?" The answer was given in terms similar to those of the question- "I acknawlege myself to be a man subject to infirmity, and one that has need of correctioun and admonitioun; and tharefoir I maist willingly submit and subject my self to the hailsume

VIII. Ordination.

disciplin &c. &c." Then there was a further question asked of the people, and a word spoken to the nobility. After this came the ordination prayer, which was followed by the giving of the "right hand of fellowship"- "The prayer ended, the rest of the Ministers, if any be, and Elders of that Kirk present, in signe of their consents, sall tak the elected by the hand--" Then followed the pronouncing of a blessing on the newly admitted minister, and a last exhortation to him regarding the duties of his office. The service concluded with the singing of the twenty-third Psalm.(1). This was a simple, but one has the feeling, a very impressive service. It might, perhaps, lose something of its impressiveness after it had been similarly repeated according to the Form at numerous ordinations during a number of years.

A description of an ordination service of a much later date is given in the Diary of Johnston, of Warriston- "Upon Wedensday, 11 of Apryle (1638), I ryde out to the Pans, heard Mr. Robert Ker preatch upon the last v. 5 ch. 2 Corinth-
"He maid
"~~He said~~ him sin for us quho kneu no sin; that we may be the righteousness of God in him." I heard Mr. Andreu Blakhal (Minister of Aberlady) schew the duties betwixt ane pastor and the people, and very sensibly tuitch al the corruptions of this tyme or of any in the presbyterie; then I sau him with the whol brethren of the presbyterie give imposition of hands; and thereby admission to the ministerie to Mr. Robert Ker to be conjunct minister with his fayther in the churchne of the Pans--"(2)

Ordination services, we may conclude, were not much unlike these Scottish ones in all the Reformed Churches in ~~1717~~-
(1) Laing's Knox. Vol.II.pp.144-150. (2) Diary. p.338.

different lands.

In contrast with the above simple forms of service we may place an outline of the ordination service for the priesthood in the later Mediaeval Church. Something like the following was ⁱⁿ the Pre-Reformation Pontificals —

- 1) Eucharist.
- 2) Presentation of Candidates, and final enquiry regarding them.
- 3) Litany and Special Clauses.
- 4) Admonition to Candidates.
- 5) Imposition of Hands by Bishops and Priests, in silence.
- 6) Bidding and Collect.
- 7) Consecratory Prayer.
- 8) Placing the Stole over the right shoulder of the candidate, with the formula- Accipe jugum Domini.
- 9) Vesting with the Chasuble, using the formula- Accipe vestem sacerdotalem.
- 10) Bidding.
- 11) Consecration.
- 12) Singing of- Veni, Creator.
- 13) Anointing of hands of Candidate in consecration.
- 14) Delivery of the "Instruments", the chalice and paten, with the formula- Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Dei, missamque celebrare, tam pro vivis quam pro ~~defunctis~~ defunctis.
- 15) Second imposition of hands by the Bishop alone, who also breathes in the face of the Candidate, with the formula- Accipe Spiritum Sanctum; quorum remiseric peccata &c.
- 16) Kiss and Pax.
- 17) Special Blessing.
- 18) Exhortation. (1)

This with all the accompaniments of a richly vested officiating bishop and clergy, and with other ceremonial usages, must have been a very imposing service, a great contrast to the simple ordination service of the Reformed Churches.

The usual items in Reformed Church ordination services came to be, fasting, prayer, preaching, laying on of hands, questions to ^{candidate} ~~ministers~~ and people, exhortations to both, and sometimes, the right hand of fellowship. It is not surprising, considering Acts XIII.2., that fasting was associated in some

(1) Moberley-"Ministerial Priesthood." p.257. Procter & Frere.

"New History of the Book of Common Prayer."

VIII. Ordination.

way with ordinations. Calvin, in the "Institutes", in explaining the expressions he has used in connection ^{with} the "Call" refers to fasting in this matter- "The expression -"in what way"- I use not in reference to the rite of choosing, but only to the religious fear which is to be observed in election. Hence the fastings and prayers which Luke narrates that the faithful employed when they elected presbyters, Acts XIV.23. For, understanding that the business was the most serious in which they could engage, they did not venture to act without the greatest reverence and solicitude." (1). Calvin apparently approves of fasting in connection with "elections," or at any rate some observance which made the people feel the seriousness of what they were doing when they were engaged in the procedure of a "call". Probably he was supposing any fasting there would be, would be before the actual ordination service. That was not the way it was taken up by English Reformed Churchmen. In the "Second Admonition to Parliament" drawn up by Cartwright in 1572, in referring to an ordination, in describing the proceedings, sets down- "after a sermon made according to the occasion, and earnest prayer to God with fasting according to the example of the scriptures--"(2). In the "Form of Church Government" of the Westminster Assembly the directions are quite explicit- "Upon the day appointed for ordination, which is to be performed in that church where he that is to be ordained is to serve, a solemn fast shall be kept by the congregation, that they may the

(1) Calvin- Inst. Bk.IV. Chap.III.12.

(2) "Puritan Manifestoes". p.97.

VIII. Ordination.

more earnestly join in prayer for a blessing upon the ordinance of Christ, and the labours of his servant for their good."(1). The Scottish Second Book of Discipline also seems to connect the fasting with the actual ceremony of ordination- "The Ceremonies of Ordinatione are Fasting, earnest Prayer, and Imposition of Hands of the Elderschip."(2). Preaching was, without exception, a part of the ordination service, and exhortations, and also prayer in every case. This we can know from the Reformed Church Confessions and Forms beginning with the Züricher Prädicanten-ordnung of 1532.(3). As to the ceremony of giving "the right hand of fellowship", this may have been practised more or less commonly. The French Church, we can notice, used it after a certain date, if not before. The Synod of 1609 when passing resolutions regarding the Ordination Service, has- "And prayer being ended, and the new Pastor risen up, the two Ministers deputed by the Synod or Colloquy, shall give him in the presence of all the people the Right Hand of Fellowship."(4). This ceremony was adopted in Scotland, as we have already seen from the Ordination as set forth in the Form of 1561. This ceremony may have been originally intended as a substitute for the laying on of hands, though later both ceremonies were observed.

The rite or ceremony of the imposition or laying on of hands in the service of admission to the Ministerial Order of the Reformed Churches will need a somewhat more ~~lengthy~~ lengthy attention from us. It was not always a part of the ordination

(1) Westminster Assembly- "Form of Church Government" p.589.

(2) Dunlop. Vol.II. p.768.

(3) Richter. Vol.I. p.168.

(4) Synodicon. Vol.I.p.314. Campbell. I.8. p.5.

VIII. Ordination.

service in all the Reformed Churches. There were notable exceptions in the earlier years to the more usual plan of using this rite. It is found in the early ordination service of Zürich, 1532. In the ordination address which the Decanus makes are these words, and the direction following them-"So biss jnen ein Vorbild imm Wort, imm Wandel, imm der Liebe, imm Geist, imm Glouben und Luterkeit : und Gott verglyche dir sinen heyligen Geist, dass du wie ein getrüwer Diener sines Herren handlist, inn dem Namen Gottes - Und damit lege er jm die HEND uff."(1). The first Helvetic Confession, of 1536, included the rite as part of the admission to the Ministry.(2). And later the Second Helvetic Confession, 1566, has- "Et qui electi sunt, ordinentur a senioribus cum orationibus publicis, et impositione manuum."(3).

Calvin, however, took up a more critical attitude to the rite. In the "Ordonnances" of Geneva, 1541, in the regulations for the ceremony of admission to the Ministry, the "laying on of hands" is omitted. The reason for this is given with the regulation- "Quant à la manière de l'introduire ~~pour~~ pour ce que les cérémonies du temps passé ont été tournées en beaucoup de superstitions à cause de l'infirmité du temps."(4).

The omission, then, was in order to avoid what might possibly lead on to Papal Church superstitions creeping in through the use of this rite in ordinations. ~~He would have been quite willing to admit the use of it~~ But Calvin did not disapprove of the laying on of hands itself. He would have been quite

willing to admit the use of it in ordinations if superstition

(1) Daniel. Vol.III. p.234. (2) Niemeyer. pp.110,119.

(3) Niemeyer. p.507. (4) Meyer. p.263.

VIII. Ordination.

could be avoided. In the "Institutes" he wrote- "It is certain that when the Apostles appointed anyone to the ministry, they used no other ceremony than the laying on of hands."(1). That consideration was quite sufficient with Calvin to prevent him being against this as an ordination rite, and indeed to make him in favour of its use where it might not be against the interests of true religion.

We must not, however, conclude that Calvin, because he had a guarded approval of this ~~right~~ rite, considered that ordination without it was in any way imperfect. We may be sure he did not think so in the least, or he would not have agreed to it being omitted from the "Ordonnances". He would think that ordination could be fully carried out without it, for his theories of admission to the Ministry involved that. If there were the election of an approved candidate, and he were publicly and solemnly admitted into the Ministry, that was an entirely sufficient ordination. The candidate had been the subject of the full "call", and that in itself was an ordination to the ministry with its consummation of the solemn setting apart with or without the laying-on-of-hands.

Grub, in his "Ecclesiastical History of Scotland", has had something of this in his mind when he describes the entrance of John Knox into the Reformed Ministry at St. Andrews in 1546. He says- "When this discourse was finished, turning to Knox, he (Rough) charged him not to refuse the office to which he was now called by the people. After some hesitation, Knox obeyed

(1) Calvin. Inst. Bk.IV. Chap.III.16.

VIII. Ordination.

the summons. No ~~other ceremony~~ laying on of hands or other ceremony was used, and no allusion was made to the priestly ordination which he had already received. The solemn deliberate choice of the people was held to be the only authority requisite for conferring the ministerial office."(1). Grub's remarks here appear to be somewhat of an anachronism. At this stage in Scotland we can hardly suppose that Rough and the other Reformation supporters, and Knox himself, had adopted very definite theories about ordination, as Grub suggests. He says that no mention was made about Knox's priestly ordination. There was no need for anything of the kind. Everybody knew that Knox was a priest of the Mediaeval Church, and there is nothing to show that Rough and the others were attempting to give Knox at this time some other ordination, or that Knox at this time was taking up the position that his ordination as a priest was of no account, and that he needed some other. In the case of Knox, Grub has not got a good subject for the application of his remarks. If he had applied them to Calvin, they might have been more appropriate.

Calvin had never been ordained in the way which is usually thought of as ordination. In the Mediaeval Church as ^{boy and} a young man ~~had~~ he had received certain benefices, which he used to maintain him in his student life, and he may even have received the tonsure.(2). But he was never ordained as a priest in the Papal Church. And in the Reformed Church he received, so far as we know, no formal ceremonial ordination. He had been invited by the Genevan authorities to be a minister in their city.

(1) Grub. p.52.

(2) Walker- "John Calvin." p.29.

VIII. Ordination.

He had been recognized ^{and accepted} as a minister by all the people, in fact by all that constituted the Genevan Reformed Church, and that was enough. He considered that enough for himself. Farel, his fellow-worker, was in a like position. He had never been ceremonially ordained. And Poulain, the leader of the French-Walloon Church, was the same. And there were others. One may just notice that Melancthon, in the Lutheran Church, had also never been ceremonially ordained. But they would all consider themselves to be truly in the Ministry. In fact Calvin was ready to declare, although he thought admission to the Ministerial Order ought to be regularised, yet in time of need, God had His own special calling of men, and placing of them, in the Ministry apart from human and church regulations. There was such a thing as an immediate ~~call~~ "call", which might most surely place a man in the Ministerial Office. So when referring to the Apostles, Prophets, and Evangelists, mentioned in Eph.IV.11., he says- "The lord raised up the other three (these three offices) at the beginning of His kingdom, and still occasionally raises them up when the necessity of the times require."(1). And so having been raised up, these are as much true ministers as any others. With regard to Poulain, we have the opinion of Calvin on his rightfulness in the Ministry. Some in Frankfurt had questioned whether Poulain was a proper minister. Calvin wrote declaring that in the unsettled state of the religious affairs, because Poulain had gathered a congregation, and others had done the same, that would stand in place of the "call" in their cases. (2)

(1) Calvin- Inst. Bk.IV. Chap.III.4

(2) Calvin- Lettres (Bonnet, ~~French~~) Vol.III.PP. 241, 242.

VIII. Ordination.

That very plainly showed that Calvin believed that under special circumstances, there could be a right entrance into the "ministry where the ordinary formalities and ceremonial were wanting. A view of this kind also finds expression in the French Confession of Faith of 1559, with which Calvin is supposed to have had much to do- "Laquelle exception nous y adioustons notamment, pour qu'il a fallu quelques fois, et mesmes de nostre temps + auquel l'estat de l'Eglise estoit interrompu+, que Dieu ait susité gens d'une façon extraordinaire, pour dresser l'Église de nouveau, qui estoit en ruine et désolation."(1).

No doubt it was in consequence of the attitude of Calvin to the rite of laying-on-of-hands, considering it, at least, not necessary for a right ordination, ^{and} ~~that~~, in view of possible superstitions arising through the use of it, at present inexpedient, that the French and Scottish Reformed Churches did not at the first make it a necessary part of the ceremony of ordination. They followed Calvin more than the German-Swiss Reformed Churches. The French Church in the early days used the rite ^{being} as good but not necessary. The first National Synod, of 1559 decreed--- "Their election shall be confirmed by Prayers and Imposition of Hands by the Ministers, yet without Superstition, or Opinion of Necessity."(2). The National Synod of 1565 declared- "That there being neither Precept nor Promise touching this matter, therefore no necessary obligation shall be established about it."(3). And the National Synod at Rochelle, 1571, laid

(1) Kidd. p.670.

(2) Synodicon. Vol.I. p.3.

(3) Do. Vol.I. p.62.

down much the same- "Although the Usage of Imposition of Hands be good and holy, yet it shall not be reputed necessary as if it were the Substance of Ordination."(1).

The Scottish Church in its First Book of Discipline shows a more decided attitude to the rite than the French Church, and follows more closely the Genevan "Ordonnances". It decides for this- "Other ceremonie then the publict approbatioun of the people, and declaratioun of the cheiff minister, that the persone thair presented is appoynted to serve that Kirk, we can nott approve: for albeit the Apostillis used the impositioun of handis, yet seing the mirakle is ^{ceased} ~~ceased~~, the using of the ceremonie we juge is nott necessarie."(2). That is a fairly plain and straightforward statement. It is what Grub by an anachronism imagines was in force when Knox became a Reformation preacher at St. Andrews. The question of what constituted correct ordination would, as we have already noticed, hardly at that time have been definitely formulated in Scotland, and would hardly have arisen in connection with the receiving as a preacher one who was a priest of the then established Church, as Knox was. But if the way of ordination of a kind such as Grub suggests was practised ^{at St. Andrews in 1547,} ~~then~~ had not then come in, the ^{First} ~~Second~~ Book of Discipline ^{in 1560} made something like it the principle in ordination. And the solemn setting apart of the elected minister did not need the rite of imposition of hands, and was not to have it. This principle was at once put into practice. In the "Form" which was drawn up in 1561 (1560 old ~~style~~)

(1) Synodicon. Vol.I. p.93.
 (2) Laing's Knox. Vol.II. p.193.

VIII. Ordination.

style) for the solemn setting apart of Superintendents and Ministers, the laying on of hands was not included. The full title of the Form is- "The Forme and Ordour of the Election of the Superintendents, quhilk may serve also in Election of All Uther Ministers." The use of the word "Election" in the title is significant. The "Call", or "Election", was so much consummated and summarised in the solemn setting apart that this could be spoken of as the "Election", and could ~~give~~ ~~have~~ give the ceremony its constituting and ordaining force, and the word "Election" could stand almost as the equivalent of the word "Ordination". Whether we are right in finding suggestion of such as this in the title of the "Form" or not, at any rate the contents of the "Form" seem to show the ceremony of solemn setting apart to have been the final application (if one may use the expression) of the whole procedure of the "Call", which was so largely made up of "election", and which, as we have seen, was regarded ^{as} the essential making of a minister. If we admit this view, we shall easily understand that this service of setting apart could be regarded as sufficient ordination without any added rite of imposition of hands - a rite which was thought to have its disadvantages in the way of possible superstitions being connected with it.

Some scholars of the Church of Scotland have surprisingly found great difficulties when considering this matter of the omission of the imposition of hands both in the "Discipline" and in the "Form", and they have made some curious comments thereon and offered some strange explanations of the omission.

VIII. Ordination.

The late Principal Story describes the omission as an "abrupt departure from Apostolic usage", and goes on with what looks like humorous contempt to discredit the reason given in the "Discipline" for the omission. That reason was- "Albeit the Apostillis used the imposition of handis, yet seeing the mirakle is ceassed, the using of the ceremonie we juge is nott necessarie." Dr. Story says- "Knox and the other authors of that book were evidently under the impression that the apostles, by the imposition of hands, imparted some miraculous gift- a superstition they ought to have rid themselves of when they bade farewell to "the works of man's invention" such as- to use Knox's own words- "pilgrimages, pardons, and other sic baggage."⁽¹⁾ Dr. Story unfairly criticises in this way Knox and the others who drew up the "Discipline". However Dr. Story might regard belief in miraculous gifts^{under the hands of the Apostles} as a superstition, these Reformers, who knew their Bibles well, could not be expected to do so, nor to reject^{to} when rejecting superstitions. To believe in wonders worked by the Apostles' hands they would have emphatically denied to be a superstition. They had Scriptural support for such wonders taking place, if not at the ordaining of church officials, certainly in other cases. // In Acts VIII, it looks as if some wonders took place with the laying on of the hands of Peter and John, or Simon Magus would not have offered money to purchase the same power to work the wonders. And in Acts XIX, where Paul lays his hands on "certain disciples" who had only received "John's baptism", we read - "And when Paul had

(1) Story- "Apostolic Ministry &c." p.245 et seq.

VIII. Ordination.

laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues and prophesied"(Acts XIX.6.) And we read in Acts XXVIII, of the Apostle Paul laying his hands on the father of Publius and healing him of a fever,(ActsXXVIII.8) Knowing the New Testament as they did, the Scottish Reformers could believe in wonders worked under the hands of Apostles, ^{without superstition.} and their view of superstitions was that they were those religious usages and beliefs for which there was no warrant in the Scriptures. ~~Dr. Story's~~ Dr. Story's criticism is a mistaken one. What precisely the Reformers meant by the phrase- "seeing the mirakle is ceassed"- it would be difficult to say. Perhaps they did think that the Apostles worked a wonder in ordaining by imposition of hands, and there would be no superstition in that from their Scriptural point of view. Most likely, however, they were having in their minds the conviction that the general power and working of the Apostles had passed away. Knox and his colleagues, like other Reformed Churchmen of the time, believed that the Apostleship was an office which had ceased in the ~~Churche~~ Church, and so also its peculiar actions and powers would cease with it.

We notice that the "Discipline" and Dr. Story are in agreement in regarding the omission of the rite of laying-on-of-hands as a departure from Apostolic usage. Were they right? Was the laying-on-of-hands the Apostolic usage in ordaining? We have no proof at all that this was an invariable usage or even a fairly regular usage of the Apoatles belonging to the original Apostolic band. The only example of them doing anything

VIII. Ordination.

of the kind was in the case of the appointment of the "Seven" as reported in Acts VI.6. But these men were not appointed to the preaching or teaching ministry, but only to be "servers of tables". It may be argued that if the Apostles used this ceremony for a lower Christian service they would use it still more for a higher Christian service. That may be, but we are left to surmise. What nine out of the Twelve Apostles did, either in the way of ordinations or anything else, we know nothing. We know that of the remaining three, James was martyred early in the history of the Christian community, and of the little we know of John and Peter, the accounts do not tell us of their usages in ordaining. Of those outside the circle of the Twelve, we know something of what the Apostle Paul and his coadjutors did. The laying-on-of-hands in the appointing of church officials was used by them, and apparently also by others in the churches they had to do with. There was the laying on of hands of the presbytery."(1 Tim.IV.14.). To what extent this was a custom through all the Christian communities, it would be difficult to say. Paul and others used laying-on-of-hands for all kinds of purposes, as well as in the appointing of church officials.

Even if, as is largely unknown, the use of this ceremony in the appointing of church officials was the regular^{custom} of the Apostles, its omission in the Scottish "Discipline" and "Form" was not quite^{such} an abrupt departure from that custom as is implied in the word "abrupt". It was not here found for the first time. We have noticed that the rite had been discarded in the Genevan Church, and that was about twenty

VIII. Ordination.

years before the Scottish documents were published. And we have seen that the French Church was inclined the same way at that time. But it is possible to⁸⁰ much further back than Reformation times to find evidences of the omission of the rite. It is possible that in the early centuries of the Church this ceremonial in ordinations was not always strictly carried out. Bishop Wordsworth, in editing Sarapion's Prayer Book, an Egyptian Pontifical of about 350-356 A.D., says, - "Doubtless actual touch was originally intended in all Benedictions, as we should gather from the *ὑπο χεира προσελθειν* of the Laodicean Canon, and the "ad manum episcopi accedere," so frequent in the accounts of the Liturgy of Jerusalem furnished by the Gallic pilgrim generally known as Sylvia. But as numbers increased, actual touch dropped in many cases, and extension of hands was substituted. So it was in the Roman Church in regard to Confirmation, and in the Ordination of Presbyters at the time of saying what is clearly the old "form" of ordination, the long (1) prayer which can be traced back to the earliest sacramentaries."

Another scholar who was troubled over the omission of the rite of imposition of ~~hands~~ hands was Dr. Sprott. In his Introduction to the Book of Common/~~Order~~ Order, because of the omission he writes unfavourably of the First Book of Discipline, and in fact tries to discredit it. He says - "The First Book of Discipline says that the laying on of hands was not necessary in ordination, but that book was never law, civil or ecclesiastical." (2)

It is of little moment for the question whether it was ever

(1) Wordsworth. Bishop Sarapion's Prayer Book. p.52.

(2) Sprott. Book of Common Order. p.xlvi.

VIII. Ordination.

civil law or not. Civil law never rightfully regulates the internal affairs of the Church. But was the "Discipline" never ecclesiastical law as Dr. Sprott asserts? In answer to this one has to say that it was hardly intended to be what we would generally call law. It was not meant to be a legal code for the Church. For its drawing up the following was the occasion as related in its Preface. The Reformers had been asked "to committ to writing -----oure jugementis tuiching the Reformation of Religion ---"Upone the recept quhairof (of the request) sa mony of us as wer in this Toune did convene, and in unitie of mynd do offer unto your Wisdomes these Headis subsequent for commoun ordour and uniformitie to be observed in this Realme concernyng Doctryne, administratioun of Sacramentis, ---- Eccl-
Discipline,
esiasticall, and Policye of the Kirk."(1). This then is what the "Discipline is, the judgments of the leaders of the Church "tuiching the Reformation of Religion" in Scotland. It is what they had committed to writing with a solemn sense of their responsibility according to the charge which had been given them, as the Preface says-"in the name of the Eternall God, as we will ansuer in his presence." It is what they believed should be instituted for the Church, as regards its Doctrine, its Worship, its Polity, and what they were moving to have instituted. At the lowest estimate it is a very valuable document for it lets us know the persuasions of the great leaders of the Reformation in Scotland, and what they thought was best for the Church at that time. Quite apart from it ever being civil or ecclesiastical law, its provisions must have great weight. In this

(1) Laing's Knox. Vol.II. p.184.

VIII. Ordination.

particular matter, for example, of the omission of the rite of the impositions of hands in ordination, no discrediting of the "Discipline", such as has been attempted, can alter the fact that the Reformation leaders in Scotland were in favour of that, for the time being at any rate.

But really the men who drew up the "Discipline" were practically the executive of what there was of the Reformed Church at that time. It was almost as if the Church ^{was} ~~were~~ putting forth the document. It was practically issued with the "imprimatur" of the Church. ~~We need~~ We need not say that this made it ecclesiastical law, for it was not law. But this made it an authoritative Reformation "Directory" for the Church, and in spite of the ^{want of the} official secular civil authorisation, such it became and was immediately acted upon as far as ~~possible~~ possible. Of course the financial provisions of it could not be applied without the government consent. But the religious arrangements of it could, and were. Its provisions regarding the Sacraments, Public Worship, and Discipline, were followed. It became regulative for the election and admission of Ministers, and for the appointment of Readers, and last but not least, for the setting up and appointing of Superintendents. Those to whom the office of the Superintendent is a favourite institution are very ready to acknowledge the authority of the "Discipline" in that respect. Its ~~authoritative~~ authority, however, was also there seen with regard to the omission of the rite of laying-on-of-hands. It would be due to it, ~~that~~ and because the same church leaders were at work, that that rite was also omitted in the "Form", and

VIII. Ordinations.

that the rite was omitted in, at least, a proportion of the ordinations, ~~perhaps~~ greater or less, for a number of years to come.

Dr. Leishman in his article on "The Ritual of the Church of Scotland" admits that nothing was laid down in the "Form" of Admission as to laying-on-of-hands. Yet it appears as if he could not believe that there really was the omission of the rite in practice. He argues that this "Form" was prepared for the admission of Spottiswood, and that he was already in the Ministerial Order of the Church of England, and consequently did not need the rite, and so it was useless putting it into the ~~"Form"~~ "Form"; and, moreover, the "Form" was used "for sixty years at the admission of all ministers without any mention of ^{imposit-}~~admiss-~~ion of hands, though the ceremony was used for at least most of that time."(1). In all this there are some very questionable assertions. To begin with, the "Form" was not prepared for the admission of Spottiswood specially. Its title plainly refutes that assertion. And its contents tell us the same. As being the first admitted according to the "Form" the name of Spottiswood is given in it, ^{naturally enough,} where Knox is relating in his History the event. There is no need to suppose that Spottiswood's name was included in all editions of the "Form", unless it was so left there as an explanatory example how other names would be inserted suitably to the occasion. The whole contents of the "Form" have not Spottiswood specially in view. He was being admitted as a Superintendent, and the "Form" is not exclusively

(1) Leishman. "The Ritual of the Church of Scotland" in

Story's "Church of Scotland". Vol.V.

p.246 et seq.

VIII. Ordination.

for the admission of Superintendents, but also for that of ordinary Ministers; and as there were far more Ministers to be admitted than Superintendents, it could not be even chiefly for use with the admission of Superintendents. The contents bear this out. Except ^{where "Superintendent" designates Spottiswood,} in the opening part, ^{and with one question} petition in a prayer at the end, the whole ceremony does not specialise in superintendents. The questions asked of the candidates are not more appropriate for superintendents than for ordinary ministers, perhaps less so. The answer to one of the most important practical questions is described as- "The Answer of the Superintendent, or Minister to be elected." Those who favour the prelatie character of the office of the Superintendent may decide whether these words are more appropriate for them or ordinary ministers, which occur in this important answer- "For the vocation of God to bear charge within his Kirk, maketh not men tyrantes, nor lordis, but appoynteth thame Servandis, Watchemen, and Pastoris of the Flock."(1). Further, the asking for the assent of a congregation, as is prescribed in the "Form", to the admission of the candidate, is inappropriate for a prospective Superintendent as a Superintendent, for in that capacity he was not to be over a congregation, although it was required of him to have a charge. The "Form", indeed, was not prepared specially for Spottiswood or any other superintendent.

But ~~farther~~ further if it had been prepared specially for the admission of Spottiswood, that would not provide us with any assured reason for the omission of the laying-on-of-hands;

(1) Laing's Knox. Vol.II. p.147.

VIII. Ordination.

on the ground that Spottiswood had already been ordained in England. If he was ordained, was it as a deacon or as a priest ? That is a question of some importance in the matter. As a matter of fact we have no proof that he ever was ordained in the Church of England. It is true he had been acquainted with Cranmer, but is it likely that Cranmer would ordain all the young men he had to do with and became interested in, either as deacon or priest ? Would it be likely in the case of Spottiswood, unless he was definitely intending to enter the ministry of the Church of England, of which we have no signs ?

Dr. Leishman's further assertion that the laying-on-of-hands was practised along with the use of the "Form" although there was the omission of it in the "Form" will be true if we say, sometimes, and keep in mind it was not always so. It would hardly be so when the "Form" first came into use, especially with that ~~dir~~ direction in the "Discipline" against the rite. Dr. Leishman seems inclined to admit this, but he says- "As a rule those who were admitted under it were in Spottiswood's position. They were clergymen already." (1). This is a very questionable statement. It is unnecessary to say more on the subject of Spottiswood's position. And of course Dr. Leishman does not mean that the men first admitted had been ordained in the English Church, but in the Mediaeval Church. But the clergy of the old Mediaeval Church were mostly unfitted to be ministers, and at the first the best that could be done with them, if they entered the Reformed Church, was to allow them to be Readers, and Readers were not Ministers. There were of course some Papal

(1) Leishman. "The Ritual of the Church of Scotland."

VIII. Ordination.

priests admitted to the Ministry, if they could pass the "trials" and be elected. That was what counted, and not previous Papal priesthood. And we have the case of one most important man, who was made a Superintendent, and who certainly was not a "clergyman" beforehand, but a layman, viz. John Erskine of Dun. As regards him it is not ^{even} ^{that he} _^ certain _^, and the other three remaining Superintendents also, had ever any ceremonial admission to their office. Probably they had. If they had, it would be according to the "Form" with its very omission of the laying-on-of-hands.

Dr. ^mMcMillan in his book- "The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church" follows Dr. Leishman in thinking that nothing is said of the laying-on-of-hands in the "Form" because Spottiswood was already in English Church Orders. The weakness of this view has been pointed out above. He also goes on to say-"The First Book of Discipline may indicate that this ceremony was not always used."(1). What does he mean by that ? "Was not always used"- when,- in the past, or in the future ? The First Book of Discipline does not indicate what was used, it lays down what is to be used, or, to be more exact, what it disapproves of being used, and that is, the laying-on-of-hands in ordinations.

Dr. McMillan ~~also~~ further says regarding the omission of the rite in the "Discipline"- "It seems to the writer (himself) that what must have been in view, was the admission of those who were already priests to benefices."(2). This is a quite unsupported surmise. The whole section in the "Discipline" has to do with (1) McMillan. "The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church". p.347.

(2) Do.

Do.

VIII. Ordination.

with the admission of any approved candidates to the Ministry. There is nothing to indicate otherwise. Moreover, the Reformed Church leaders were not so keen on admitting ex-priests to the ministry, that they would make their only regulation in the "Discipline" regarding the ceremony of admission to the Ministry to be applicable only to ex-priests, as if they had no others in mind for admission but these. As a ~~matter of~~ matter of fact in all the Reformed Churches they were somewhat suspicious of ex-priests for the Reformed Ministry. For example take this from the French Discipline- "Those newly received into the Church, particularly monks and priests, shall not be elected to the ministry without long and careful testing and investigating of both their life ~~and their life~~ and their doctrine- to be approved over a space of at least two years from their conversion, and confirmed by reliable testimony from the districts in which they have lived; nor shall they, nor shall any unknown person, be ordained without sanction of Provincial and National Synods."⁽¹⁾ And as another example this may be taken from a Reformed Church document in England of about 1584- "Popishe priests by force of their admissyon cannot be Ministers of the Ghosples --"(2). And in Scotland they were no more in favour for the Ministry. Erskine of Dun was blamed for admitting some of them even as Readers.⁽³⁾ And an ex-bishop of the Mediaeval Church was not greatly welcome. There is no need to think that because some of the leaders of the Reformed Church had ^{themselves} been priests or friars or monks, that predisposed them to bring as many others of the same ~~kind~~ kind

(1) Campbell. I.2. p.1. Cf. Synodicon. Vol.I. p.269.

(2) "Seconde Parte of a Register" Vol.I. p.258.

(3) Cunningham. Vol.I. footnote, p.211.

VIII. Ordination

into the Ministry. Perhaps they were too well aware of what the average ^{priest} or monk was like.

The simplest and most natural conclusion to come to with regard to the omission of the imposition of hands in both the "Discipline" and the "Form" is, that the Reformed Church of Scotland started off with the belief that this rite was unnecessary or inexpedient, agreeing more or less with the "Ordonnances" of Geneva and the "Disciplines" of the French Church. How soon the rite came to be practised commonly in the Scottish Church, it would be hard to say. Grub considers that it was used for the first time in 1572, and under episcopal (prelatic) influences.⁽¹⁾ It is possible there is the first mention of it then, but it is not likely it would be the first time of using. It might receive a kind of sanction when the Assembly agreed to the Second Helvetic Confession in ~~1566~~ 1566, for that Confession upheld ordination "a senioribus cum orationibus publicis et impositione ~~manuum~~ manuum." After that the rite may occasionally have been used, and ^{so} on with increasing frequency. Then when the Second Book of Discipline came out in 1581, it definitely authorised the rite, though this is to be noticed, the wording does not indicate any enforcing of the rite in ordinations. And it was not enforced at all. Ministers were admitted freely, in what proportions one cannot say, without the use of the rite, and without that being thought irregular. Andrew Melville, although occupying some of the highest positions in the Church, yet apparently had never been ordained with imposition of hands. And Robert Bruce, the leading minister in Edinburgh, had been admitted

(1) Grub. History. Vol.II. p.180.

VIII. Ordination.

without the rite as minister without any question, indeed with the Assembly concurring in his appointment and not requiring any ceremonial of imposition of hands. That was about 1587. He continued as an honoured minister in Edinburgh for over ten years, and occupied the highest places in the ministry. He was Moderator of the General Assembly twice. He was recognized as minister by all, the king included. If the king had not turned to be his enemy, ^{the form of} his ordination would never probably have been questioned. The Assembly of 1597 was led to make the rite of "imposition" obligatory in ordinations, which was done under the influence of the king, who ~~enacted~~ meant to use this enactment against Bruce. It was probably not enforced retrospectively in general, but it was in the case of Bruce. But even when the process, conducted by the king, was in progress against Bruce, so little did the Presbytery of Edinburgh, either for the past or the present regard the rite to be necessary for admission to the ministry that it gave Bruce a clear certification of the lawfulness of his office- "The whole brethren being present, gave their resolute answer, without contradiction, that they had acknowledged, and did acknowledge, him to be a lawful pastor of the said kirk, by whom God in his mercy, had wrought in the said pastoral charge, and by whose travails the whole Kirk and themselves, had received great comfort." (1)

Moreover, Bruce himself, who was well acquainted with the principles of the Church, and was an honourable, conscientious, and devoted man, had complete assurance in his own mind, that

(1) Wodrow- Life of Bruce. p.72.

VIII. Ordination.

According to the principles of his Church hitherto, he was a lawful minister. Others, it is impossible to say what proportion of the ministry, were in the same position as Bruce. And even after his case was over these would continue in the ministry unquestioned, for the Assembly's enactment regarding ordinations would not be made retrospective. It can hardly be doubted that in the Scottish Reformed Church, beginning with a direction against the rite of "imposition", the rite continued to be regarded as unnecessary from thirty to forty years after the Church had been instituted, even though it might come to be practised more and more.

However, a different attitude to the rite was being ~~ad~~ taken up by the other Reformed Churches which had either set it aside or considered it unnecessary. In the Reformed Church of France, the National Synod of 1601 enacted- "The Ceremony of Imposing Hands in ordination, and receiving Ministers, shall be always observed."(1). And the Synod of 1603 enacted that the ceremony was always to be carried through "solemnly and publickly in the face of the whole Church."(2). So strongly was the French Church feeling in this matter that when they knew of their unordained students, who were studying in Geneva, ^{being} ~~were~~ allowed to preach and dispense the sacraments, they sent a remonstrance to the Church of Geneva from the Synod of 1603. To them it seemed quite unlawful for a student, being without ordination, which now necessarily with them included the "imposition", should be allowed to take up ministerial duties. Such

(1) Synodicon. Vol.I. p.210.

(2) Do. Do. P.228.

VIII. Ordination.

was now contrary to their discipline. And also that Synod of 1603 enacted that- "If Deacons of the Church of Bearne in Switzerland should come into this Kingdom, and have not been first duely examined and ordained by imposition of hands, or have not had elsewhere any Pastoral Charge, and should yet notwithstanding, as they have done in other places, take upon them to exercise the Ministerial Office, to Preach the Word, to administer the Sacraments, as the Mode of some Forraign Churches is so to do; they shall first subject themselves to a new examination here, and be received into the Ministry among us, in that very selfsame way as Proposans are, who never were Ordained. And for other Persons, who were duely examined, and to whom the right hand of Fellowship hath been given in Forreign Churches, and are now called to a Pastoral Charge in some one of our Churches in this Kingdom, they shall be admitted by the Provincial Synods according to the manner prescribed by our discipline."(1).

All this goes to show that the French Church was becoming more exacting with regard to the ceremonial of Ordination, judging that it required the "imposition", and that those without that were not eligible for their Ministry until they had received the proper ordination, as they thought of it. Perhaps, however, we may gather from the above passage that they were willing to relax so far as to admit to their Ministry foreign ministers for whom the only rite in ordination had been the giving of the right hand of fellowship, Or are we to infer that the Provincial Synods would additionally ordain these men according to their

"Discipline"? This enactment of the Synod also reveals to us,
(1) Synodicon. Vol.I. p.232.

VIII. Ordination.

along with the contents of the remonstrance to the Genevan Church, that the Foreign Churches, and particularly the Swiss Churches, were not as particular about the ceremony of Ordination, nor as to full ceremonial ordination going before ministerial work, as the French Church was becoming. And another enactment of that same Synod of 1603 shows what stress the French Church was placing on the rite of "imposition," as being that peculiarly for the ordination of a minister. It is as follows—"On the first Article of the third chapter- That custom observed in some Churches, of ordaining Elders by imposition of hands, shall be abolished."(1). The Synod was rather disregarding the usages of the New Testament, for there we find the laying-on-of-hands used upon a variety of persons and for various purposes.

If the Swiss Churches had been less inclined to lay ^{some particular} stress on ~~the~~ ceremonial of Ordination, as we have seen, the German-Swiss Churches from the first practised the "imposition" in ordinations. And Geneva, which by its "Ordonnances" had set aside the rite, came to adopt it as a recognized observance in ordinations, though not with the regulation for full publicity, "~~before~~ⁱⁿ the face of the whole church," as in France. "L'imposition des mains, précédée d'une allocution du modérateur, se donnait en séance de la Compagnie, "les portes étant ouvertes", c'est-à-dire que les parents et amis des impositionnaires, les membres des Conseils, &c., y étaient admis. Ces consécérations privées avaient un caractère si spécial d'intimité et d'édification, que les pasteurs y tenaient beaucoup. Ce fut seulement

(1) Synodicon. Vol.I. p.229.

VIII. Ordination.

en 1872 que la Compagnie consentit à siéger en ces occasions dans un des temples de la ville- St-Pierre ou la Madeleine."(1).

In England, during the Elizabethan period, there seems to have been no thought of ordinations which did not include the rite of imposition of hands.(2). We may look at one statement on the subject, that of Udall in "A Demonstration of Discipline &c.", where he quotes other authorities- "Every officer of the Church must be ordayned by the laying on of the hands of the Eldership (Presbytery), T.C. (Thomas Cartwright) 2 booke, I part, page 274. Discip. Ecclesiast. fol.53."(3). Here Udall includes elders in the same method of ordination as ministers. For another expression ^{of like view,} which also includes all officials of the Church in ~~the same~~ the same way of ordaining, there is this from a Reformed Church document of the same period- "The ordeyninge of all officers requyreth two thinges, 1) Prayer; 2) laying on of handes."(4).

When we come to the Westminster Assembly in the 17th. Century, the laying-on-of-hands is fixed as obligatory in Ordinations-"Every minister of the word is to be ordained by imposition of hands."(5). And that "High Church" Presbyterian Provincial Assembly, in its "Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici", which it issued in 1654, went so far as to claim for the rite of ^{along with the rest of the ceremony,} "imposition" in ordination, ^{that it was an ordinance of Christ-}

"That the work of Ordination, that is to say- An outward solemn

(1). Eyer. p.294.

(2) "Seconde Parte of a Register". Vol.I. pp.164,167,207.
Vol.II. p.218

(3) Udall. "A Demonstration &c." p.40.

(4) "Seconde Parte of a Register". Vol.I. p.167.

(5) Westminster "Form of Church Government." pp.584,586,
590.

VIII. Ordination.

constituting and setting apart of persons to the office of the Ministry, by prayer, fasting, and imposition of hands of the Presbytery, is an ordinance of Christ."(1).

It may be that, after all, the early position taken up by some of the Reformed Churches with regard to the ~~rite~~ rite of imposition^{of} hands in ordinations, was the most correct, to regard it, even if good in normal circumstances, yet not absolutely necessary. It was not only Reformed Churchmen who could think in this way. Some in the ²English Church, with its prelacy, were of this opinion. Francis Mason, in the early part of the 17th. Century, wrote, saying that the words-"Receive ye the Holy Ghost"&c were sufficient to make the complete ordination of a priest.(2) Another man, called Wake, in the latter part of the same Century said- "The outward sign of it we confess to have been usually imposition of hands, and as such we ourselves ~~we~~ observe it; yet as we do not read that Christ Himself instituted that sign, much less tied the promise of any certain grace to it, so M. de Meaux may please to consider that there are many of his own communion that do not think it to be essential to Holy Orders."(3). That was quite a strong point to make when the above writer said that Christ did not use the rite, if only he had added, so far as we know.

It will be of much interest to know how Roman Catholics have regarded the rite, and do regard it. It may be said at once that one gathers that it is not regarded by them as the most

(1) "Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici". Chap.X. p.156.

(2) Mason. "Church of England and Episcopacy." p.86.

(3) Do.

Do.

p.346.

VIII. Ordination.

important of the rites they use in the ordination of priests. The following extracts are taken from a "Letter" sent out by the Roman Catholic Cardinal Archbishop ~~of~~ and Bishops of the Province of Westminster, in reply to a Letter addressed to them by the Anglican Archbishops of Canterbury and York, in 1898. They give a quotation, which they agree with, from the Opinion of Cardinal Casanata in the Gordon case in 1704. Casanata, among other things, says- "It is true that in their (Scottish and English Prelatic ~~Episcopal~~ Episcopal) ordination, there is imposition of hands, and that many theologians, appealing to the use of the Greeks and other reasons, hold that imposition of hands suffices without the delivery of the instruments (i.e. the giving of the chalice and paten to the candidate for the priesthood at his ordination). But apart from the fact that ~~this~~ this cannot be said with certainty, as long as the Church, or a notable part of the same, has assigned the said delivery as the matter in her ordination----- apart from this, I say, the imposition of hands is an ambiguous sign, which needs to be determined to signify a particular power either by the accompanying words or by other circumstances."(1). They also quote from the Bull, "Apostolicae Curae", of Leo XIII, 1894, which deals with Anglican Orders- "On the other hand to quote from the Bull, the principles just explained "appear still more clearly in Holy Orders, the matter (i.e. the ceremonial act) is so far as we have to consider it in this case, is the imposition of hands; which indeed by itself signifies nothing

(1) "Letter" of the Cardinal Archbishop &c. p.22.

VIII. Ordination.

definite, and is equally used for sacred orders and for Confirmation. Particularly, therefore, in the rite for Holy Orders, we must look to the words accompanying the imposition of hands and ascertain whether they definitely signify, or express, that which the sacrament is intended to convey--".(1).

Another writer, a priest in the Roman Catholic diocese of Westminster, has a book on the subject entitled-"The Popes and the Ordinal". It is a collection of documents bearing on the question of Anglican Orders. In his introduction, this editor says-"Now to apply this (the necessity for both right "matter" and right "form", that is, for right ceremonial act and right formula of words, in ordinations) to the Sacrament of Holy Order as it is claimed among Anglicans. The valid "matter" (the laying on of hands) is there, that is not disputed. ----- But laying on of hands is not, alone and apart from the words that are used, distinctive of ordination."(2)

Apparently the chief "matter" (ceremonial act) in the Roman Catholic ordinations is the delivery of the "instruments" (the chalice and paten), and this also must have the right "form" (formula). Such as this Aquinas had taught in the 13th. Century. With him imposition of hands is only part of the preparation for the real giving of the priesthood- "This preparation consists of three things, viz. blessing, imposition of hands, and anointing,"----- "The conferring of power is effected by giving them something pertaining to their proper act. And since the

principal act of a priest is to consecrate the body and blood

(2) A.S.Barnes. "The Popes and the Ordinal." p.74.

(1) "Letter". of the Cardinal Archbishop &c. p.32.

VIII. Ordination.

of Christ, the priestly character is imprinted at the very giving of the chalice under the prescribed form of words."(1).

These views coming from authorities in the Papal Church may, in one way or another, help to clarify our opinions as to the value of the rite of "imposition of hands". They may also help us the better to understand the attitude of Reformed Churchmen, of the period now under review, to the rite. In concluding this discussion of the subject, it will be well to return to the Reformed Church convictions on the question. It has to be noticed that they were not perfectly constant or uniform. Perhaps the average conviction in most of the Churches for the period is as set forth by Calvin in the "Institutes"- "But though there is no fixed precept concerning the laying on of hands, yet as we see it was uniformly observed by the Apostles, this careful observance ought to be regarded by us in the light of a precept. And it is certainly useful, that by such a symbol the dignity of the ministry should be commended to the people, and he who is ordained reminded that he is no longer his own, but is bound in service to God and the Church. Besides it will not prove an empty sign, if it be restored to its genuine origin. For if the Spirit of God has not instituted any thing in the Church in vain, this ceremony of his appointment we shall ^{feel} not to be useless, provided it be not superstitiously abused."(2). With most of this Reformed Churchmen of later times can agree, except the statement that the rite was "uniformly observed by the Apostles" and whatever may depend ~~of~~ on that in Calvin's thoughts.

(1) Aquinas- "Summa Theologica". Sacrament of Order. Q. XXXVII.5
(2) Calvin. "Institutes". Bk. IV. Chap. III. 16.

VIII. Ordination.

We have now just briefly to notice the Agent or Agents in Admissions or Ordinations of the Reformed Churches. The Agent of ~~ordination~~ ordination in the Papal Church had been the prelatie bishop. The Reformed Churches did away with such an office. Henceforth it is to be a Minister or Ministers, at times joined with others, who are to be the agents of ordination. We ~~shall~~ shall see there is some variety of arrangement in the matter in the various churches and at different times. The chief differences in the agents of ordination will be that sometimes the act of ordination will be performed by one minister, in other cases by several ministers, and in other cases by ministers and laymen. The Züricher Prädicantenordnung of 1532, gives the act of ordination to the Decanus. In the First Helvetic Confession, it is the laying on of hands ~~of the~~ "der eelteren", or, "presbyterorum sacerdotis" (1), which latter phrase is somewhat peculiar, but may be meant to indicate the ministerial elders, by a bad apposition. The Second Helvetic Confession says it is to be "a senioribus". (2). The Schaffhausen "Agenda", ~~of~~ of 1592, says it is "der Ordinator und die Beistander" who make the imposition of hands. (3). In Geneva, when the laying-on-of-hands had been introduced, it was done by the hands of the Moderator. (4). The "Ordonnances" of 1541 had only "un des ministres" to give an address as to the office to which the candidate was being ordained, and to offer prayer.

The "Ordonnances" of 1576 had the same. In the French Church

(1) Niemeyer, pp. 110, 119.

(2) Do. I. 507

(3) Daniel. Vol. III. p. 275.

(4) ~~de~~ Meyer. p. 40.

VIII. Ordination.

the first Synod, of 1559, gives the ordination act to the "Ministers"(1); the Synod of 1609 mentions the Pastor, who will be offering the ordination prayer, as the one to "lay hands" on the candidate(2); ~~the~~ and the "Discipline", according to the Edition of 1675, has two deputed by the Synod or Colloquy to take part in ~~the~~ Ordinations. One will preach, and offer the ordination prayer, and make the imposition of hands, and the two together will give the right hand of fellowship.(3). In England, sometimes they would have the elders joining with the minister in the laying-on-of-hands. So is it in the "Second Admonition to Parliament" by Cartwright, 1572- "He (the minister) and the elders shall lay their hands on him (the candidate).(4). A document of about 1582, giving "Articles of Discipline" for the Church, assigned the ordination act to "some sufficient neighbour ministers".(5). Another document of 1586, "An Acte for the Reformation of the Ministerie in the Church of England", enjoins, "thereupon shall the minister sent from the Conference (Presbytery) and those that are the elders of that parishe, laye their hands uppon the said newe chosin pastor."(6) In another document of 1587, a minister deputed from the Assembly (perhaps a kind of Presbytery) will prdain "in the name of all the Assemblie with laying on of hands, to give him chardge to preach and to minister the sacraments."(7). We can notice that these English Reformed Churchmen of the Elizabethan period were not averse to

(1) Synodicon. Vol.I. p.3.

(2) Do. Do. p.214.

(3) Campbell. I.8.a. p.3.

(4) "Puritan Manifestoes". p.97.

(5) "Seconde Parte of a Register". Vol.I. p.165.

(6) Do. Do. p.208.

(7) Do. Vol.II. p.218.

VIII. Ordination.

elders taking part in the ordination act. Yet in all cases they prescribe that a minister or ministers must be acting.

Under the Scottish First Book of Discipline, "some especiall minister" will do all that is necessary in the way of preaching and the other exercises belonging to the formal admission of a minister to his charge.(1). When Spottiswood was admitted as superintendent, ~~it was~~ the "especiall minister" was "Johne Knox, being Minister or Moderator," who preached and was the acting minister. It is interesting to note that according to the "The Forme or Ordour" of 1561, elders are given their part in the ordination ceremony. After the "Ordination Prayer" and before, what may be called, the "Ordination Blessing", there is, what seems to be, the ceremony or rite of the giving of the right hand of fellowship, and the Elders join in that, the only ceremonial act at that time- "The prayer ended, the rest of the Ministers, if ony be, and Elders of, the Kirk present, in signe of their consents, sall tak the elected by the hand--"(2).

The "first "Discipline" also provided for Superintendents⁽³⁾ to "plant and erect churches, to set ordour and appoint ministers." This became one of their ordinary and principal duties. Now they carried out the ordaining in the first years, and with what kind of ceremony, we cannot say with certainty, but in most cases, probably we shall not be far wrong if we conclude, it was done according to the "Forme and Ordour" of 1561, but perhaps without rigidly adhering to it. The usual phrases for

(1) Laing's Knox. Vol.II. p.193.

(2) Do. Do. p.149.

(3) Do. Do. P.202.

VIII. Ordination.

the ordaining or admitting were "admitting" or "planting" ministers. These phrases might perhaps be ^{also} used where there was no ordination but only the induction of a man who had had a charge previously. Whatever the ceremonial it would probably have, sometimes at least, to be carried out by a Superintendent alone in the early years. Later, in 1575, we find it enacted - which shows that Superintendents had acted alone sometimes- "That no Superintendents nor Commissioners-for-planting-kirks, have nor sall give collatioun of benefices, nor admitt Ministers, without the assistance of thrie of their qualified Ministers of their province"(1). Settled ministers were now increasing in numbers, and there was no necessity for Superintendents to act alone in carrying through ordinations.

The Second Book of Discipline in ordination arranges for the "imposition of the hands of the Elderschip," that would be at that time, of an association of ^{ministers and elders and} ~~neighbouring~~ Kirk Sessions of local neighbouring churches most likely, for no more definite church authority at that time could be mentioned, as Presbyteries were only just being organized. After Presbyteries had come into being, and were functioning, it ~~was by~~ was by them that ordinations were performed. So Row states in his History of the Kirk of Scotland. Speaking of the state of affairs when the Church had become organized, he says-"The Kirk then about this time, 1580,1581, being well governed by Kirk Sessions, Presbyteries, Provincial and General Assemblies ----- that day whereon a minister was admitted, the whole number of the brethren of

(1) Univ. Kirk. Vol.I. p.294.

VIII. Ordination.

the Presbytery ----- and the whole congregation giving their consent, all being present; and after sermon, imposition of hands was made by all the ministers of the Presbytery there convened."(1). Row seems to have named rather too early dates. Presbyteries were only just being established in 1581, and their full functioning and activities could not ~~begin~~ begin at once. In a year or two after the dates he mentions, it would be as he relates. We notice that the whole Presbytery, elders as well as ministers, were there authorising the ordination, and so far assisting at it, but it was the ministers, all of them, who performed the ordaining act. When presbyteries were able to resume their functions, after their temporary suspension during the period of the irregular prelacy brought about by James VI, they again were the agents of ordination. We can take two examples of ordination services of that time. One has already been brought forward in these pages, that related by ~~J~~ Johnston of Warriston in his Diary, which took place at Prestonpans in 1628. We only quote again a few words from his description which have to do with our present subject, as follows- "I saw him (the minister of Aberlady, who had just given the "charges") with the whole brethren of the presbyterie give imposition of hands."(2) Another case is that of John Row, as given in the Aberdeen Council Register- "The fourtent day of December 1641, the said Mr. Johne Rowe was admitted one of the ministers of this brught, and got imposition of handis be the moderatour and brethrene of the Presbitrie of Aberdeene, in the presence of the haill congregat-ioun, immediatlie after sermone maid in the Old Kirk be Mr.

(1) Row's History. p.79. (2) Johnston's Diary. p.333.

VIII. Ordination.

David Lindsay, Moderatour."(1).

When the Westminster Assembly ^{came} had to deal with the matter, it had to rule out two agents of ordination, the prelatie bishops and the "independent church." The ruling out of the first was not so difficult just then, for it came in the very commission ^{of Parliament} by which the Assembly was called together- "Whereas it hath been declared and resolved by the Lords and Commons assembled in Parliament, that the present Church government, by archbishops, bishops, their chancellors, &c. &c. -----is evil, and justly offensive and burdensome to the kingdom, a great impediment to reformation and growth of religion ----- and that therefore they are resolved that the same shall be taken away."(2).

To rule out the second, that of ordination by the "independent church" was not so easy. There were some members of the Assembly who were Independents, and very assertive of their views. Nye, the Independent, suggested at one time that-"Ordination, for the substance of it, is the solemnization of an officer's (officers are church officials, including ministers) outward call, in which the elders of the church, in the name of Christ, and for the church, do, by a visible sign, design the person, and ratify his separation to his office."(3). He is meaning that the elders of a local congregation can be the ordainers of all church officials, including ministers. At another time he is more revolutionary. He "openly professed that ordination is not essential to a minister; but a minister may be a minister to all points without ordination."(4). The usual ~~independent~~

(1) Row's History, Pref. p.xliii. (2) Ordinance, 1643.

(3) Lightfoot. p.122.114.(4) Lightfoot. p.122.

VIII. Ordination.

position of the Independents, however, was to hold to such as this, that a congregation, even with no more than seven members, in its entire independence of all other churches "could choose and ordain all necessary church-officers (officials) including ministers."(1). The Assembly in May, 1644, dealt with the matter and found good reasons for resolving- "No single congregation⁽²⁾ may ordinarily assume to itself all and sole power in ordination!" When the Assembly had finally concluded on the subject, this was its finding- "Ordination is the act of a presbytery. The power of ~~ordering~~ ordering the whole work of ordination is in the whole presbytery ----- It is very requisite, that no single congregation, that can conveniently associate, do assume to itself all and sole power of ordination."(3). One can safely say that the clause, "that can conveniently associate", would not have been there except for the difficulties of the times, the need of ministers, and the slow organization of Presbyteries to ordain them, and the resolution of the Assembly would have stood in its rigidity without that clause. The Assembly further decreed that the act of ordination was to be "by those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong."(4). What was meant seems to have been that the whole membership of the Presbytery present, ministers and elders, were responsible for, and were as a body carrying through the ordination, were the ordaining agent, yet the very ordaining rite was to be performed by the ministers. It is just possible, however, there

(1) Hetherington. Hist. of Westr. Assemb. p.199.

(2) Gillespie. Westr. Assemb. p.59.

(3) & (4) ~~Westr~~ Westr. Assemb. "Form of Church Government."

VIII. Ordination.

was not the intention of entirely shutting out elders from having part in the ordaining rite. Gillespie presents us with some evidence for this. He relates that on Sept. 12th., 1644, there was discussion on some objection of Parliament to what had been done in the matter. It was decided to reaffirm- "Ordination by preaching presbyters is an ordinance of Christ", which Mr. Marshall - not contradicted by any - expounded in this sense, That where there is ordination, preaching presbyters must be in the quorum, not that no other may act in the business".(1). Which seemed to show that although ^{ordination by} preaching presbyters was believed to be an ordinance of Christ, it did not follow that the sharing in it by others was against the ordinance of Christ. Gillespie was satisfied with this explanation, for he apparently had favoured elders having their part.

The Provincial Assembly of London, in its pronouncement of 1654, "Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici", confirms the enactment of the Westminster Assembly on ~~the~~^{the} subject of agents of ordination, but is somewhat stiffer if anything and gives more details. It rules- "That the power of ordering the whole work of Ordination belongs to the whole Presbytery, that is, to the Teaching and Ruling Elders. But Imposition of Hands is to be always by Preaching Presbyters, and the rather because it is accompanied with Prayer and Exhortation, both before, in, and after, which is the proper work of the teaching Elder."(2). And it goes still further into details- "Imposition of hands ought to be performed not by one

(1) Gillespie. Westr. Assemb. p.71. (2) "Jus Div. Minist. Ev." Pt.I. p.181.

VIII. Ordination.

single Presbyter, but by a combination of preaching Presbyters." (1)

Thus we see there was some want of uniformity among the Reformed Churches with regard to the Agent or Agents for effecting ordination. But there were certain broad general principles. We can think of two negative ones, i) that ordination had not to be by a prelatie bishop for the future, ii) that it had not to be privately and independently by a single congregation. And we can think of two positive ones, a) that ordination must be by the authority of the organized church, either through a church court, or a deputed agent, and b) that it must be in the main and principally, if not wholly, ~~the~~ with respect to an ordaining rite, the action of a minister or ministers.

It might have been better if less stress had been laid on that last, that the ordaining act belongs wholly, or even mainly, to ministers, and if the occasional readiness, as it is seen, to give elders a part in the rite, had been ^{made} a recognized regulation in ordinations. A passage in Von Hoffmann's book can incline our way of thinking in this matter. He writes describing views and resolutions of the Synod of Middelburg, of the Reformed Church of the Netherlands- "Den zweiten Abschnitt bildet die "handtoplegghinhe". Sie bedeutet eine Ordination in dem Sinne, dass damit der kandidat in den Berufsstand der Prediger aufgenommen wird. -----Da die Gefahr nahe lag, dass diese Handauflegung im Sinne der katholischen Ordination aufgefasst wurde, so rieten die Kirchenordnungen zur Vorsicht bei der Handhabung, sie sollte nur vorgenommen werden "soo het de ghelegenhheit der Kercke lijden mach." (2).

(1) "Jus D.M.E." Pt.I. p181. (2) Hoffmann. Kirchenverfassungsrecht. p.118

VIII. Ordination.

From this quotation we see that the Netherlands Church, which can be taken as example of other Churches, felt the need of guarding against superstition arising in connection with the rite of laying-on-of-hands. Calvin had warned against superstition possibly arising out of the rite. There certainly were dangers of that kind, of connecting with it some mysterious succession, or the ~~bestowal~~ bestowal almost magically of gifts. We shall be discussing these matters later. One of the best means of destroying the possibility of any such superstitions in connection with the rite, would have been by having lay-elders, along with the ministers, taking part in it. And it may be said, That if the Reformed Churches had firmly and definitely prescribed that, they would have, almost more firmly than they did, established the position of their Ministerial Order. If we agree that Ordination is the authorization of candidates for the Ministry by the Visible Church, in the name of Christ, to enter into and be of the Ministerial Order, and which has to be carried through by the representatives of that organized Visible Church, a view to which we are led by the insistence of Reformed Churchmen on the necessity of the "Public Call" or Election" to the Ministry, then the more representative of the Visible Church are the ordaining agents, the stronger will be the ordination. No doubt prelatie bishops in ordaining may be taken to represent the Visible Church. But a broader and deeper and more comprehensive representation will be found, which will include both ministerial and lay elements in an authorised court of the Visible Church of Christ. An ordination of such a kind will more nearly approach an ordination by the whole great Visible Church.

IX. The Result of Ordination:

The Question of the "Indelible Character".

In the Papal Church there have been said to be certain effects of Ordination. These are the bestowal of a grace, and the imprinting of an "indelible character." That there are these effects of ordination is very strongly affirmed, especially the latter one. With respect to grace, Aquinas, in the "Summa Theologica", says- "Sanctifying grace is given in the sacrament of Order." (1). And again- "The degree of Order does not result from their having grace, but from their participating in a sacrament of grace." (2). With regard to the "indelible character" he says- "And indelible character, in the Sacrament of Order, is imprinted on those of all the Orders, even on door keepers and acolytes." (3). The Council of Trent is still more emphatic- "Si quis dixerit per sacram ordinationem non dari Spiritum sanctum; ac proinde frustra episcopos dicere : Accipe Spiritum sanctum; aut per eam non imprimi characterem; vel ~~per~~ eum, qui sacerdos semel fuit, laicum rursus fieri posse; anathema sit." (4). In the Catholic Encyclopaedia, in the section on "Holy Order", there is a brief explanation of what is meant by the "Indelible Character"; as follows- "The principle effect of the Sacrament (of Order) is a spiritual and indelible mark impressed upon the soul, by which the recipient is distinguished from others, designated as a minister of Christ, and deputed and empowered to perform certain offices of Divine Worship."

(1) Aquinas. "Summa". "The Sacrament of Order". Q. XXIV.1.

(2) Do. Do. Do. Q. XXIV.3.

(3) Ibid. Q. XXV.2. (4) C. of Trent. De Sacramento Ordinis. Canon. IV.

IX. Results of Ordination.

The Reformers looked askance at these doctrines of ordination grace and the "indelible character". With regard to the latter, they had not the same strong antagonism to it as they had to some doctrines ~~current~~ current in the Papal Church, as for example, that of transubstantiation. Perhaps they felt there was some grain of truth in it. What a man once has been, whether a priest or anything else, of that he can never afterwards wholly rid himself, nor of its effects in his life. Whatever experience a man has had, specially a religious experience like ordination, it will not be likely afterwards wholly to be obliterated from his life. The men of the Reformation, doubtless, would have been ready to agree to that. What suspicions and objections the Reformers had to the doctrine were because of the way the doctrine was enunciated by the Papal Church authorities, and ^{by reason of} some of their own general principles. To begin with they did not believe in a special priesthood. they believed in the priesthood of all believers. The spiritual character of priesthood was belonging to every Christian, and it was impossible to have something more of a priest impressed on one than that. So they could not believe that any process or rite, called ordination, could imprint or impress a priestly character on a man, making him different from all without it, and of such a kind that it was impossible for him to lose it. And they knew only too well that many priests of the Mediaeval Church had never been in the priesthood of believers. What could any "character" be worth in such cases? They knew also that some, who perhaps had been believers, had fallen away, and there had been no marvellous "character"

IX. Results of Ordination.

retaining the true believer's priesthood in them, which alone was worth while. So they scorned the "Indelible Character" doctrine as untrue or worthless. Luther says- "As far as we are taught from the Scriptures, since what we call the priesthood is a ministry, I do not see at all for what reason a man who has once been made a priest cannot become a layman again, since he differs in no wise from a layman, except by his ministerial office. But it is so far ^{from} impossible for a man to be set aside from the ministry, that even now this punishment is constantly inflicted on offending priests, who are either suspended for a time, or delivered forever of their office. For that fiction of an indelible character has been long ago an ~~object~~ object of derision."(1).

What Luther mentions there brings before us a strong reason why the Reformers would think little of the doctrine. However much the Papal Church asserted that the special inalienable priesthood existed, the authorities themselves, in judicial cases, treated condemned priests as if the priesthood could be taken away. They degraded them; they unfrocked them. They treated them without any conviction that there was a "Character" which they could not do away with. In the case of the priests who became Reformers, when the Papal authorities got them into their power, before having them burned at the stake, they deprived them of all their priestly dress, to signify they had taken the priesthood from them. The Papal authorities themselves, shewed that they did not believe in the "Indelible" Character."

IX. Results of Ordination.

And further, if the imprinting of the "Indelible Character" was connected with what was done upon the candidate for the priesthood by the repeating of the words- "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," &c., the Reformers were well aware that the lives of so many thus made priests showed no signs of any gift of the Holy Spirit, rather otherwise. It was no wonder if they concluded that if the "Indelible Character" were no more real than the gift of the Spirit as a result of the repeating of the formula, it was of no religious value even if it was there. The English Reformed Churchmen maintained against the English Prelates, as they would have done against Papal Prelates too, that they had no right even to use the formula-"Receive &c." "The bishops have no right to use these words ("Receive ye the Holy Ghost"), and"that the gifts of the holie ghost are not then given it is manifest, for many ignorant ministers neither were, nor are better furnished for these speeches of the Bishops."(1). Nobody, bishops or others, had the right to authoritatively use these words, upon all and sundry whose hearts they could not know, as if they by their authority could convey the Holy Spirit. It was for God alone so to do, Who knows the hearts of all, and^{as} the bishops had usurped an authority not theirs, it was not likely that their words could have the effect of producing an "Indelible Character" in this way.

Luther's views have been mentioned on this subject. The Reformed Churchmen would hold the same. They held by just the same doctrine of the priesthood of all believers.

(1) "Seconde Parte of a Register". Vol.I. p.125.(Dr.R.Some)

IX. Results of Ordination.

The words of Rutherford, although later than the Reformation time, quoted by the writer of the following paragraph, may fairly be taken as expressing the views of Reformed Churchmen in general- "As every one knows, an essential idea of High Church Orders is that^{There} of their indelibility. ~~There~~ may be deposition, there may be degradation, but the "character", the sacred brand still remains. When the Presbyterians were accused of teaching a similar doctrine about their Orders, the charge was indignantly denied. "We see," says Rutherford, "no indelible character because a pastor is always a pastor; if a man commits scandals, the church may call his character from him into a mere private man."(1). This writer is probably hardly correct in thinking that degradation or deposition had no effect as regards the "character". Luther, who knew the ways of the Papal Church better, had, as we have seen, a different opinion. But the quotation shows that Reformed Churchmen did not hold that their ministers had a "character" which could not be removed.

And yet, perhaps there were some notions of an indelible ministerial character which lingered in the minds of Reformed Churchmen, with respect to the Ministry. We notice that they held that, as a rule, a minister was to be a minister for life. In the French Discipline there stand these words- "These elected to the ministry must understand that it is for life, unless they are lawfully discharged by the Provincial Synod for special and weighty considerations."(2). We may safely say, whether expressed

(1) Walker. "The Theology and the Theologians Of Scotland."

(2) Campbell. I.11. p.4.

IX. Results of Ordination.

in Confessions or Directories, or not, that was the view of all the Reformed Churches. It is seen in their practice as regards the Ministry.

There is another feature of the Reformed Ministry which also shews something of the indelibility idea. When once a man was ordained he was not re-ordained. He might change from one charge to another, or from the ordinary ministry become a "deacon", or vice versa, his one ordination stood for all. New Testament support, with the indiscriminating use of Scripture common in these times, might have been found for re-ordinations. There was the case of the Apostle Paul. It might have been said that he was twice ordained; once when, in Damascus, Ananias laid his hands on him, "a chosen vessel" for the Lord, that he might "be filled with the Holy Ghost"; and again, when the prophets and teachers of Syrian Antioch "laid their hands" on him and Barnabas, and sent them on their first missionary journey. ~~This~~ This, however, did not move the Reformed Churchmen to admit re-ordinations. The question, perhaps, was not often raised among them. It came up in the Westminster Assembly when certain points about ordination were being discussed. But it was only raised to be completely set aside.(1). It is true the Assembly decided that deacons of the then late prelatic Church of England must be re-ordained, or, to be more correct, further ordained- "This Assembly doth advise that they who have hitherto been ordained deacons only, according to the Form of the Church of England, be ordained presbyters before they undertake a pastoral charge in any congregation."(1). There was no proposal of real reordination there.

(1) Mitchell & Struthers. p.2.

IX. Results of Ordination.

When any were made deacons, there was no thought of ~~ordaining~~ ordaining them to the full ministry or priesthood. Although the edition of the Book of Common Prayer, which the members of the Westminster Assembly knew, used the phrase, "the Ordering of Deacons" as it also did similarly for priests, "the Ordering of Priests", (in 1562) it was as well understood then as later, when the phrase was changed to "the Making of Deacons", that deacons had only a preliminary and partial ordination. And so, as today in the Anglican Church when deacons are ordained priests, there is not the slightest suggestion of reordination, there was not anything of it in the thoughts of the members of the Westminster Assembly. They were only decreeing the ordination of deacons to the full ministry. It was very distinctly affirmed by the London Provincial Assembly, (in which the peculiar characteristics of the English Reformed Church were to be seen,) in its pronouncement of 1654, that there was to be no reordination. They had had in their minds the views of the Independents on this matter- "The Brownists (Independents) would re-ordain all that are ordained (already by prelatic bishops) amongst us".(1). And the conclusion come to was- "So certainly a Minister ordained to Preach the Word and administer ~~these~~ the Sacraments according to the mind of Christ is a lawful Minister, though ordained by a Bishop ~~in other points~~ in other points (2) Antichristian". These in the Assembly for the most part had been ordained in that way ~~themselves~~ themselves.

Another matter which showed that in the Reformed Churches

it was felt that, even if there was not an "indelible character"

(1) "Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici." Pt.II. p.1.

(2) Do.

Do. pp.15-32.

IX. Results of Ordination.

imprinted in ordination, a special quality was given which was not to be lightly regarded. This is seen in the serious view which was taken of desertion from the Ministry. It was considered a very grievous offence. This the French Discipline shows- "These who desert the ministry shall be finally excommunicated by the Provincial Syned, unless they repent, and return to the charge which God has committed to them."(1). In the Church of Scotland, too, desertion was condemned, and the deserter was thought to have fallen low. Questions were sometimes asked in the Assembly and answers given, and this very matter came up more than once. At the Assembly of Decr., 1565, there was this question- "If sick as hes once entrit in the ministrie,----- may leave their vocation and fellow the world because they cannot have a sufficient stipend ? The answer- Seeing that our master Chryst Jesus prenaunces that he is but ane mercenarie shepheard, who seeing the wolfe comeing, flieth for his awin safeguard, and that the very danger of lyfe cannot be ane sufficient excuse for sick as fall back from Jesus Chryst; We on na wayes thinks it lawfull that sick as once puts there hand to the plough, sall leave that heavinlie vocation and returne to the profane world, for indigence or povertie. Lawfullie they may leave ane unthankfull peiple, and seik wher Jesus Chryst his hely evangell may bring foerth greater fruit; but lawfullie they may never change their vocation."(2). The Assembly of Feby., 1570, gave an answer to a similar question

(3)
along the same lines. Among the "Acts" of the Assembly of

(1) Campbell. I.23. p.6.

(2) Univ. Kirk. Vol.I. p.74.

(3) Do. Do. pp.172,173.

IX. Results of Ordination.

July, 1570, was this- "Becayse some who ^{had} once accepted charge of the ministrie had des^{et}ed their calling, the Assemblie ordeaned, that all and sindrie ministers who hereafter sall accept the said office, sall be inaugurated publictlie, conferme to the order sett down in the end of the treatise of excommunicatioun; and sall protest solemmlie, that they will never leave the said vocatioun at anie time heerafter, under the paine of infamie and perjurie."(1). The Second Booke of Discipline speaks with no uncertain sound on the subject- "They that ar anis callit be Ged, and dewlie electit be Man, eftir that they have anis acceptit the Charge of the Ministerie, may not leive their Functions. The Deserteurs sould be adminishit, and in case of Obstinacie finallie excommunicate."(2). These quotations tend to show that, although there was no belief in the imprinting of an "indelible character" at ordination, there was the investing of the ordinand with a sacred office, or at any rate, an office too spiritual to be put off except by a decree of the Church.

With regard to the question of grace being given in ordination, that was a different matter frem that of ~~indelibillity~~ "indelibility". Probably the Reformed Churchmen could not see any reason why grace would not be given in every worthy experience of life. What they could not believe was, that, ^{by} an outward rite of ordination, a man, who had none of the ^{of God} grace ^{to} begin with, there and then, above others, was made to have some peculiar grace and sanctity in the priesthood.

In discussing II Tim. I.6., -"the gift of God which is

(1) Calderwood. Vol.II. p.2.

(2) Dunlop. Vol.II. p.770.

in thee by the putting on of my hands," Calvin answers the question- "Was grace given by the outward sign ?" - by saying that not exactly by the sign, but because the people were praying for blessing on Timothy, but the sign was not useless, for it was a sure pledge of the grace received from God's own hand. And Calvin goes on to explain that the grace given then, was not a ~~grace~~ grace given which Timothy had never had before, but something additional of the same grace. ^{There} ~~There~~ is no inconsistency in saying, that when God wished to make use of his services, and accordingly called him, He then fitted and enriched him still more with new gifts, or doubled those which he had previously bestowed."(1). And when commenting on Ephes. ^{IV} ~~III~~.11., Calvin says distinctly that the ordained man receives grace- "When men are called by God, gifts are necessarily connected with offices. God does not confer on men the mere name of Apostle or Pastor, but also endows them with gifts, without which they cannot properly discharge their office. He whom God has appointed to be an apostle does not bear an empty and useless title; for the divine command and ability to perform it go together."(2). This seems sound reasoning, that God will fit a man for any work which He gives him to do.

The English Reformed Churchman, John Udall, in describing the profit of having the ceremony of ordination with laying-on-of-hands, comes to show that, at such a time, God grants grace to the one being ordained, and also to the others who are concerned. He makes out-

" 1) It stirreth up everye partie (ordainers, ordained, and
 (1) Calvin. Comm. II Tim. I.6. (2) Do. Ephes. IV.11.

IX. Results of Ordination.

congregation) to pray with more fervencie."

2) It "helpeth forward the party ordained in his care (cure), to walk with a good conscience in his calling."

3) It "worketh a more acknowledfement of God's ordinance in the heartes of the peeple."

He explains how this ceremony of imposition of hands does all this. And he concludes- "It is evident it is not a vaine and idle ceremonie - as manie do imagine - but of good and profitable use in all ordinations."(1).

It is plain that, even if Reformed Churchmen could not and would not, believe that the act and rite of ordination magically produced grace, they could believe that ~~that~~ along with it, and because of the inauguration into the office of the Ministry, there could come the enabling grace of God suited to the office.

(1) Udall. "A Demonstration &c." pp.43,44.

I. Apostolic Succession.

It is not within the scope of this thesis to go thoroughly and completely into this subject of Apostolic Succession, although it is an inviting one. It will be necessary however, to try and set the matter forth in brief, for it is one with which the Reformed Churches had much to do in the Centuries under our survey, and a matter regarding which they were compelled to take up an attitude, and concerning which also, to enunciate doctrines for or against.

Under the name of Apostolic Succession go certain theories regarding the Christian Ministry. These theories are different, but they all agree in the following respects. They go on the supposition that in the Christian ministry through the centuries there has been some kind of succession or series extending from the beginnings of the Christian Church onwards, and that the succession or series started with the Apostles, and that by reason of it the ministry receives an Apostolic authoritativeness, and also receives what we may call, for want of a better word, a mysterious kind of quality which is supposed to do much for those in the succession. And they all agree in this, that the Succession in going back to the Apostles, goes back ultimately to Christ. The theories differ in the mode in which the succession takes place. We can briefly notice what the mode of succession is in the leading theories.

First, there is one theory which depends on the tracing back of an unbroken series of occupants of the same official ministerial position in the Church, generally in the same place,

X. Apostolic Succession.

to an apostle (or apostles) who first occupied the same position, and so was first in the series. This may be called the "Series" Theory of Apostolic Succession. The most notable example of it is to be found in the series claimed by the occupants of the See of Rome, according to which the series runs back to the Apostle Peter. This theory may embody the earliest notion of a succession back to the Apostles. This is the view of the writer on Apostolic Succession in the History of the Early Church edited by Dr. Swete. He says- "Alike to Irenaeus, to Hegessippus, and to Tertullian, bishops have their place in the apostolic succession only in connexion with the churches over which they preside----- (not) as a personal possession of the bishops."(1). And again- "St. Augustine then was willing enough to take up the succession argument if challenged on it; and when he did take it up, he meant quite obviously succession in the chair of a single see. The apostolic succession of the church of Rome is, as with Irenaeus, from holder to holder, not from consecrator to consecrated."(2). "As a matter of fact, there is not, within the patristic period and even considerably later, any deviation from the common and traditional conception of the meaning of Apostolic Succession, as we have seen it in vigour from the time of Hegessippus and Irenaeus onwards."(3)

In one particular of it, this kind of succession need not be looked on as a theory. If there is any case where there is an authentic ^{✓ complete} record of the long succession of ministerial holders

(1) Swete's "History &c". Essay III, by E.H. Turner, M.A.
(2) Do. Do. p.193. p.129.
(3) Do. Do. p.196.

X. Apostolic Succession.

of the same position in the same place, at the beginning of which series there was an Apostle, that would be a historic fact and not a theory. But even this would be turned into mere theory if it was held that because an Apostle was first in the series, each individual in the series received apostolic authority and an apostolic quality.

Secondly, there is a theory of Succession which is brought about by a supposed "Conveyance," or "Transmission" of office from consecrator to consecrated, which carries along with it mysteriously an apostolic quality because the transmission is supposed to have begun with the Apostles. This theory is found in two forms.

The most largely accepted ~~theory~~ form is that according to which only a part of the Ministry is actually in the full succession. This part is made up of these who are the prelatie bishops. These ~~prelates~~ prelatie bishops, according to the theory, have the power to transmit their office with all its powers to others, and also to convey to others the mysterious apostolic quality. What they do in practice is to convey to only a few the powers of their office, and to the whole body of the clergy, through ordination, the peculiar apostolic quality. One might ask why, when they have the power of transmitting so great and wonderful an office, they do not transmit it to all in the Ministry, in order that the Church might be enriched the more with the special gifts they claim to have. Is it in order to maintain a prelacy in the Ministry? Or is it because they believe they have divine sanction for a superior order in

X. Apostolic Succession.

the Ministry because of the leadership of the Apostles, and that in maintaining through the centuries in the Church a superior order in the Ministry, that is a necessary part in the maintaining an apostolic succession? This seems to be the belief. And so it continues, only a comparatively small part of the Ministerial Order is in the full succession, and carries that succession on, the other much larger part only shares in what the succession can do for it in the conveying of a certain apostolic quality.

It may be added to the above, that in connection with this theory, it has been generally held that, if any section of the Church with its prelates may fall away into heresy, or if any single prelate becomes a heretic, the true succession becomes invalidated so far as these prelates are concerned.

It is well known that both the Roman and Anglican Churches have held by the "Transmission Theory" of Succession. The Council of Trent when decreeing concerning the Hierarchy says- "Proinde sacrosancta synodus declarat, praeter ceteros ecclesiasticos gradus, episcopos, qui in apostolorum locum successerunt, ad hunc hierarchicum ordinem praecipue pertinere; et positos ----- ministros ecclesiae ordinare--"(1). That quotation contains the ~~features~~ features before referred to, transmission by prelates who are supposed to be the successors of the Apostles.

It has to be noticed, however, with regard to the Roman Catholic Church, that its ministry is supposed to be constituted by both the "Series" Theory of Succession, and the "Transmission" Theory. It lays the greatest stress on its own

(1) C. of Trent. p.136.

X. Apostolic Succession.

"Series" Theory, that is , its series or succession from Peter in the see of Rome. It also has the "Transmission" Theory attached to its bishops. It is held that without ^{both} lines of succession cooperating there will be no true Succession. It is impossible for a prelatie bishop to be a conveyer of the apostolic powers or ~~quality~~ quality unless he be in connection with, and subject to, the Papal "Series" at Rome. To be out of connection with this is schismatical or heretical, and that is sufficient to cut off from the true succession. On the other hand also, the ~~people~~ Papal "Series" at Rome will not be kept up correctly unless each member of it is reenforced in the Apostolic powers and quality such as come by the prelatie episcopal conveyers. So each Pope after his election, if he has not been consecrated before, is consecrated by prelatie bishops, thus to be one of their order.

The way the Anglican Church holds the "Transmission" Theory has been set forth frequently, and so has been made familiar to many. We will give a statement of ^{it} by the revered Anglo-Catholic leader, the late Bishop Gore. In one place he says- "But underlying this (the Apostles' office of bearing an original witness to Christ) was another - a pastorate of souls, a stewardship of divine mysteries. This office, instituted in their persons, was intended to become perpetual, and that by being transmitted from its first depositaries. It was thus intended that there should be in each generation an authoritative stewardship of the grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ, and a recognized power to transmit it, derived from above by

X. Apostolic Succession.

apostolic descent. The men who from time to time were to hold the various offices involved in the ministry would receive their authority to minister in whatever capacity, their qualifying consecration from above, in such sense that every ministerial act would be performed under the shelter of a commission, received by the transmission of the original pastoral authority, which had been delegated by Christ Himself to His Apostles."(1). The essence of the theory is given in the last clauses, "received by the transmission of the original pastoral authority &c." In another place Bishop Gore states the agents of this "transmission"- "There belongs to the order of Bishops, and to them alone, the power to perpetuate the ministry in its several grades, by the transmission of the authority received from the Apostles, its original depositaries."(2). Of course Gore, in speaking of an order of bishops, means prelatie bishops. He would not agree that "episkopos" and "presbuteros" are different designations of the same office.

Another interesting Anglo-Catholic description of the theory is given by the Rev, Leighton Pullan, as follows- "The episcopate is thus a golden chain, stretching link by link between our modern bishops (by "modern" he means "^{"contemporary"}~~cotemporary~~) and the apostles of Jesus Christ. No ministers of religion can receive the power to act as representatives of man to God and as "stewards of God's mysteries", unless they receive the laying on of hands from those whom the apostles and their representatives ordained for that purpose. This is what is meant by the

(1) Gore. "The Church and the Ministry". pp.58,59.

(2) Do.

Do.

p.98 et seq.

X. Apostolic Succession.

Apostolic Succession."(1). This writer, like Bishop Gore, by the episcopate, means a prelatic episcopate. Many other references of the same kind could be found in the writings of Anglo-Catholics. The Anglican Church has made much of this theory of succession. That their Church through its episcopate has the full apostolical "transmission" or "conveyance", is the assured belief of many Anglicans.

Without at the present criticising the theory by the way of discussing what historical support it has, one might say that perhaps the general idea of such a "golden chain" by "transmission" or "conveyance" from the Apostles has a kind of attraction about it. If we had been arranging the economy of the Christian Church ourselves, we might have been inclined to light on something of the kind. It seems all so convenient and complete and efficient an economy for the Church through the ages. It is a feeling like this which appears to have dominated Bishop Gore, for his arguments in favour of it are hardly with historical force, but are more of the kind--this would have been a most desirable arrangement, and so it must have been, and so it was. But one surely can ask questions of this kind- "Is it the highest ~~best~~ and best conception of an economy for the Church? Is it not ~~it~~ too secularly definite and humanly devised ? It is of such a kind that spiritual forces and workings are not necessary for its continuance, That which its advocates lay stress on can quite well be carried on correctly, according to their ideas, and yet be no more than an unspiritual ~~and~~ formal and mechanical

(1) Pullan. "History of the Book of Common Prayer." p.255.

X. Apostolic Succession.

succession. One does not wish to be unjust to the advocates of this theory, but in their own descriptions of it, what they lay most stress on does seem to be ^amerely outward and very formal and conventional process.

The other form of the "Transmission" or "Conveyance" ~~†~~ Theory of Succession, is one which makes the "prelatic episcopal" agent for the "transmission" or "conveyance" unessential, and perhaps even better done without. The "transmission" may be through the whole body of the ministry, which has the right of ordaining, and ^{by} its ordinations carries on the succession as much as in the other form of the theory the prelates are supposed to do. The advocates of this form of the "Transmission" Theory appear quite prepared to accept that in the actual history of the Church "transmission" has been effected through prelatic bishops, but in the early stages of the Church it was not so, and in later times it has not ^{always} been so, and that there was no need for it to be so at any time. This variant of the "Transmission" Theory has been adopted by some in the Reformed Churches, and they have endeavoured, and are endeavouring, on the grounds of it to claim what they think will be an Apostolic Succession for their own Ministry.

It is obvious that both these forms of the same theory presuppose a strictly formal process having its beginning with the Apostles and continuing down through the centuries. If the formal process is not there with a beginning, or has failed anywhere in its course, the theory is shown to be a mistaken one. And it can be said, the theory certainly is deficient in

X. Apostolic Succession.

historical support. ~~Th~~ There is no record of the necessary apostolic formal beginning of this formal process. Efforts to find such have meagre results, and are characterised by manipulations of Scripture passages. The evidence we have, seems against any formal beginning ^{with the Apostles} of such a formal process, and if such a process had no formal beginning ^{with them}, it had no beginning at all ^{with them}, for such a formal process demands a formal beginning. If this is so, then this theory of a succession from the Apostles entirely fails. But supposing for a moment, the formal process ever had had a formal beginning from the Apostles, it would depend for its value on being strictly and regularly ^{out} carried, in all respects correctly, through the centuries. The proof that that has been the case is quite deficient. The records in the early centuries are scanty and uncertain. And there have been grave disturbances to the carrying on regularly and correctly that formal process, if it ever existed, by reason of heretical churches, and heretical prelates and ministers, and by reason of Popes and Anti-Popes. The Reformed leaders, Calvin for example, were well aware of all this.

As for the "transmission" of some peculiar and mysterious apostolic quality, it certainly lacks historic proof. From the very nature of it, according to the theory, it is that which is outside historic recording. It is unobservable, it is invisible, unascertainable, mysterious. It does not seem to carry with it any certainty of the possession of the characteristics and powers of the original apostles. It has often been much the other way. Not a few of those who, according to the

X. Apostolic Succession.

the theory have been supposed ^{to} be in the "Apostolic Succession" with its mysterious "quality", have been far away from true apostolical life and conduct, and power and doctrine, living evil unchristian lives, so that whatever the invisible "quality" has been, it has meant nothing worth while in their cases. And even in the majority of the cases of ~~these~~ the more worthy men supposed by the "succession" to have the "quality", there has been nothing noticeably apostolical about them. The truly apostolical men of the Christian Church have lived apparently quite irrespective of what is claimed in this theory, and have been found either inside or outside such theoretical "successions."

The fact of there being so many unworthy subjects of the apostolical successions claimed, and ^{that} this was sufficient to stultify the theory of "transmission" of some mysterious apostolic quality, was not lost upon the Reformed leaders, as we shall see.

Thirdly, there is another theory of an Apostolic Succession. It is a kind of "Series" theory, but not that of a series of men holding the same office and in the same place, with an Apostle beginning the series, as is claimed for the Popes of Rome. It is a series made up of those who have been in a line of men passing on doctrine from predecessor to successor beginning from the Apostles. It will be a succession of men through the centuries passing on the doctrine received from the Apostles by the first in the series. This is not a theory which is generally found standing in independence of the others.

X. Apostolic Succession.

It is used to give some support to the other "~~successions~~" "successions" claimed. Within ^{any one of} these, it will be said, is the treasury of the true doctrine and traditions handed down from the Apostles, and so the "succession" must be the true one. And then by a "petitio principii" it will be said, the doctrine which is handed down in this "succession" must be the true apostolic doctrine because it is handed down in this way.

A theory of a handing down of the doctrine of the Apostles in some particular line is quite without historical support. There is no evidence to show that there ever has been any passing on of the true doctrine in any assured and definite line and series of transmitters. In the ^{mere} passing on of doctrine, history shows, that there has always been the tendency to a greater and greater departure from the original Apostolic teaching. If it had not been possible to refer back to the original sources, and to draw directly from them, it seems quite certain that the Christian Church in the "passing on" would have entirely lost the original in the course of time.

Now, it was with Papal Church forms of "succession" theories, with their papal and ~~p/p/l~~ prelatie episcopaa elements that the Protestant Reformers had to do at the first. It was only later, in England and Scotland, that Reformed Churchmen had to meet with the Anglican versions of the theories.

Luther disregarded the claims made in connection with the succession theory of the Papal Church. He probably felt that in breaking off from that Church, there must necessarily be a breaking off also from the succession which it claimed belonged to it.

X. Apostolic Succession.

The notion that ~~the~~ the Church of the Reformation could renounce the Pope and retain the "succession" would not occur to him, as it did to later Anglicans. Besides, he probably felt that the "succession", like so much of the abounding error in the Papal Church, was wrong. He was persuaded that in the Reformation movement they were free to have a Ministry with very different sanctions from that of the Ministry in the unreformed Church. In 1542 there was a new bishop to be appointed at Naumburg. The Elector John Frederick put forward Nicholas von Amsdorf to fill the vacancy. Luther had the instituting of him. He "took care," says Kostlin, "to introduce him in Evangelical manner. According to the Catholic doctrine, as is well known, the Episcopate is transmitted from the Apostles by the act of consecration, with the laying on of hands and anointing, which can only be done by one bishop to another, and only a bishop can then consecrate priest or the clergy. The Reformers would easily have been able to continue (without the Papal element, of course) this so-called Apostolical succession through the Prussian bishops who went over to them. But as they never acknowledged the necessity of this with regard to the inferior clergy, neither did they with regard to the new bishop. Luther himself consecrated Amsdorf on 20th. January together with two Evangelical superintendents of the neighbourhood, and the principal pastor and superintendent of the Evangelical congregation at Naumburg, with prayer and the laying on of hands in the presence of the various orders and a multitude of people from the town and district assembled in the Cathedral. The congregation were first informed that an honest, ~~up-~~

X. Apostolic Succession.

upright bishop had now been nominated for them by their sovereign and his estates in concert with the clergy, and they were called upon to express their own approval by an Amen, which was thereupon given loudly in response."(1). Luther in a similar way instituted George of Anhalt into the bishopric of Merseburg in 1544.(2). The Lutheran Churches continued to have a Ministry which was formed irrespective of, and independent of, the Papal Church succession theory. One exception to this was the Lutheran Church of Sweden, and apparently also the Church of Finland. The former retained the "succession" seemingly more by undesigned circumstances than by convictions.(3).

The Reformed Churchmen more definitely even than the Lutheran Churchmen left behind them the Papal Church theory of Succession. It belonged to the Papal Hierarchy, which they utterly repudiated. It was dependent on prelatic episcopacy, which was contrary to the doctrine of the equality of those in the Ministry. Besides, and most important from their point of view, they believed there was no warrant to be found for it in the Scriptures.

Being well acquainted with many who were in the "Succession" as it was supposed to be in the Papal Church, the Reformed Church leaders, judging by the lives of these men, so unapostolic, could not believe there was any truth in the Papal ^{apostolic} ~~apostolical~~ succession theory. The unlikeness to the Apostles of the Popes and their bishops is the great argument they use against the apostolic succession theory of the Papal Church, as

(1) Kostlin: Life of Luther. pp.441,442.

(2) Do. Do. p.445.

(3) Wordsworth. "The National Church of Sweden".p.207 and footnote.

X. Apostolic Succession.

we shall see. Calvin has much to say on the subject, dealing acutely and profoundly with some points. In commenting on statements in the Augsburg Interim, he says- "We certainly deny not that the Church of God has always existed in the world, for we hear what God promises concerning the perpetuity of the seed of Christ. In this way, too, we deny not that there has been an uninterrupted succession of the Church from the beginning of the Gospel even to our day; but we do not ~~conclude~~ concede that it was so fixed to external shows - that it has hitherto always been, and will henceforth always be, in possession of the bishops ----- If the Church resides in the successors of the Apostles, let us search for successors among those only who have faithfully handed down their doctrine to posterity."(1). "Very different is our case; for we deny the title of Succession of the Apostles to those who have abandoned their (the Apostles') faith and doctrine ----- Would that the Succession which they falsely allege had continued until this day: withus it would have no difficulty in obtaining the reverence which it deserves. Let the Pope, I say, be the successor of Peter, provided he perform the office of an Apostle. Wherein does the successor consist, if it be not in perpetuity of doctrine ? But if the doctrine of the Apostles has been corrupted, nay abolished and extinguished by those who would be regarded as their successors, who would not deride their foolish boasting["](2)). Calvin's words are a challenge

to Popes and Papal clergy to prove their apostolic succession

(1) Calvin. Tracts. Vol.III. p.264.

(2) Do. Do. Do. p.265.

X. Apostolic Succession.

by their apostolicity.

He further points out that popes and clergy lie under excommunication themselves by the very canons they would use to degrade or deny the episcopacy or priesthood of others, and so are no longer real bishops and priests, and as so, are no longer of the kind to keep up an apostolic succession. In the "Institutes" he says- "They (the authorities of the Papal Church) make the Greeks schismatics. Why ? Because, by revolting from the Apostolic See, they lost their privilege. What ? Do not those who revolt from Christ much more deserve to lose it ? It follows, therefore, that the pretence of succession is vain, if posterity do not retain the truth of Christ, which was handed down to them by their fathers, safe and uncorrupted, and continue in it."(1). And again, using an argument with similar force- "One thing I say, which even they themselves will not be able to deny: among bishops there is scarcely an individual, and among the parochial clergy not one in a hundred, who, if sentence were passed on his conduct according to the ancient canons, would not deserve to be excommunicated, or at least deposed from his office. I seem to say what is almost incredible, so completely has the ancient discipline, which enjoined strict censure of the morals of the clergy become obsolete; but such the fact really is. Let those who serve under the banner and auspices of the Romish See now go and boast of their sacerdotal order. It is certain that that which they have is neither from Christ, nor His apostles, nor the fathers, nor the early Church."(2). All such arguments, strong

(1) Calvin. Inst. Bk.IV. Chap.II.2.

(2) Do. Do. Do. Chap.V.14.

X. Apostolic Succession.

at any time, were specially strong at a time, when everywhere the corruptions amongst the clergy of the Mediaeval Church, from the highest to the lowest, were being discussed and condemned.

But Calvin could use other arguments besides these. He could point out that the ~~chief~~ chief feature of the Papal priesthood in being a sacrificing priesthood, was not a succession from the Apostles. He could refer to the fact of the Papal schisms, and of heretical bishops ~~in some~~ in some places breaking the supposed continuity in the succession of rightly instituted bishops, and so disturbing the whole working of what was the supposed Apostolic succession.

More plainly, however, than by statements and arguments, the actual attitude of the Reformed Churches to the Papal Church Succession Theory is seen in the ordinary practice and deliberate procedure and polity of the Churches. In admitting men to the Ministry, it was ^{not} counted to be in their favour in the least that any of the candidates had been in the Orders of the Papal Church Succession. In fact, as has been before noticed in these pages, they were rather more careful in admitting those of this kind, than others not having been in Papal Orders. And in being admitted to the Ministry, the candidates were obliged to conform to the Reformed Church order of admission. In a letter to the "Brethren of Lyons", which Calvin wrote in 1542, he describes the hesitation he had, and the testing he employed, before receiving a Carmelite monk into the Ministry, and a final putting of the man from his purpose.(1). In the French Discipline there are directions, part of which we have already quoted, with ~~regard~~ ^{regard} ~~to~~ to

(1) Bonnet. Calvin's Letters. Vol.I. pp.300-307.

I. Apostolic Succession.

cases of Papal clergy seeking to enter the Reformed Ministry. "Those newly received into the Church, particularly monks and priests, shall not be elected to the Ministry without long and careful testing and investigating of both their life and their doctrine - to be approved over a space of at least two years from their conversion, and confirmed by reliable testimony from the districts in which, they have lived; nor shall they, nor shall any unknown persons, be ordained without the sanction of Provincial and National Synods." "No bishop or priest aspiring to the ministry of the Gospel shall be eligible thereto without first becoming a true member of the Church, renouncing all his benefices and other claims connected with the Church of Rome, acknowledging - as advised by the Consistory - all his errors committed in the past and giving practical and long sustained proof of his repentance and of a good life."(1).

In England in the Elizabethan period, the dominant party in the Church, made so, one should say, by the Queen, set up a church organization similar to that of the Mediaeval Church without the Pope. At first no claim was made for an Apostolic Succession of a similar kind to that in the Papal Church, nor of any other kind. It was rather otherwise. The bishops claimed in defending themselves against the arguments of the English Reformed Churchmen, who were contending for an English Church without prelates, that the Queen had a right to set up what officers she liked in the Church, that that was a part of the royal prerogative. They said nothing about a rightful and divinely

(1) Campbell. I.2,3. p.1.

X. Apostolic Succession.

authorised position in the Church, which was theirs, due to an Apostolic Succession, which, if they had held by it, they would have thought a very useful argument. The position Whitgift takes up is clear in his "Answer", and his "Defence" of 1574 against Cartwright's "Admonition" of 1572.(1). In all his famous debate with Cartwright, although an Apostolic Succession claim would have been so useful to him, he does not bring one forward. And Cooper, the Bishop of Winchester, in his "Admonition to the People of England", 1589, a defence of the English prelates against the Reformed Church movement, not only does not, in all his book, use an argument on Apostolic Succession lines to defend the existence of the prelates and their ~~and~~ ~~their~~ clergy, but he actually repudiates a Succession- "That our Bishops and Ministers doe not challenge to holde by succession, it is most euident; their whole doctrine and preaching is contrary: they understand and teach, that neither they, nor any other can have God's favour so annexed and tyed to them, but that, if they have their dueties by Gods worde prescribed, they must in his sight lease the preheminance of his ministers, and bee subject to his wrath and punishment. They knowe, and declare to all men, that the couenant on the behalfe of Levi, that is on the behalfe of the Ministers of God to be perfourmed, consisteth in these three branches: by preaching to teache the right way of salvation, and to sette ~~foorth~~/ foorth the true worship of God: to keepe peace and quietnesse in the Church of God: and thirdly by honest life to bee example unto others."(2).

(1) Whitgift's Works, Vol.I. "Answer", pp.258,259,262.
"Defence", pp. 20,21,27.

(2) Cooper. "Admonition". p.153.

I. Apostolic Succession.

If prelates of the English Church were of that way of thinking, much more so were the Reformed Churchmen. One might have been inclined to think they could have lived contentedly inside a Church with bishops of this kind, so far as a claim of Apostolic Succession was concerned, yet they would not, and perhaps one reason in their minds was a fear lest with prelatic bishops, the old Papal Church Succession Theory might come in again, a fear, if they had it, which the later trend in the English Church justified. Because of their doctrine of equality in the Ministry, the Reformed Churchmen were against prelacy, but perhaps they also deeply distrusted what implications there might be in the very office of a prelatic bishop. Cartwright wrote a "Confutation" of the Papal Church annotators of the Rheims New Testament. In one place the annotators had said- "And this place of the Apostle assuring to the true church a perpetuall visible continuance of Pastors and Apostles or their successors, warranted the Holy Fathers to try all Heretickes by the most famous succession of the Popes of Rome." Cartwright replied that the succession of the Popes was rather uncertain. We wish he would have said a little more on that point, as he could have done. With reference to the remark about the trying of heretics, he quotes the words of Vincentius Lyrinensis- "The Holy Scripture is the onely touchstone."(1). There can be no doubt that the English Reformed Churchmen of Elizabeth's reign denied the theory of Succession of the Papal Church, and all that it ~~implied~~ implied.

(1) Cartwright. "Confutation". p.492.

X. Apostolic Succession.

As for Scotland, early in the Reformation movement there, and before it had prevailed, we have at least one testimony against the theory of "Succession". It occurs in a Treatise by Balnaves on Justification by Faith, of date 1543. It was edited by John Knox. We will have to notice this Treatise again. Here we will only look at these words- "My Kartes ! yee which have entered in the Church of Christ by the Bishoppe of Romes law and authoritie, with his faire bulles, your shaven crounes, smearing you with oyle or chreame, and cloathing you with all ceremonies commanded in your law. If yee thinke you are there through the successours of the Apostles and fathers of the Church, ye are greatly deceaved, for that is but a politike successioun or ceremonial."(1).

When the Reformation was at last establishing itself in Scotland, in the Confession of Faith of 1560, there was a repudiation of the Papal Church theory of Succession. In the Confession, when the Notes of the True Church are given, there occur the words- "The nottis, signes, and assured tokenis, whairby the immaculat spouse of Christ Jesus is knawin from that horrible harlote the Kirke malignant, we affirm ar neyther antiquities, title usurped, lineall discente &c."(2). With the words "Lineall discente", the Succession theory of the Papal Church is rejected. And the Scottish Reformed Church acted on that. Knox had been a priest in the Mediaeval Church. He was degraded, about 1556, by the Papal Church authorities from the priesthood.(3). That troubled him little. Ninian Winzet, ~~1532~~

(1) Laing's Knox. Vol.III. p.460.

(2) Do. Vol.II. p.110.

(3) Do. Vol. IV. p.464. Editor's Preface.

X. Apostolic Succession.

upon calling him to prove his other ordination in the Ministry, casts this up against him- Sen ye renunce and estemis that ordination null, or erar (rather) wickit, be the quhilk sumtyme ze ware callit Schir Johne."(1). Knox would think he knew of a better Succession than what came by Rome.

Like the French Church, the Scottish Reformed Church attached no value to any supposed "quality" through Papal Church Succession, in candidates for the Ministry. The Assenbly of Decr. 1562, "ordeaned according to the fourth head of the Booke of Discipline, that all persons serving in the ministrie, who had not entered into their charges, according to the order appointed in the said Booke, be inhibited ----- and that this act have strenth, als weill against those who are called Bishops asmothers"§§§§ ---- (2). There was not much favour there for the Apostolic Succession of the Papal Church. Those supposed to be ~~in it~~ in it had to be "tried," and "examined", and "admitted" to the Ministry the same as any others. At the Assembly of Augt., 1573, it was stated that most of the canons, monks, and friars, had become Protestants. They were not, however, accepted for the regular ministry, as their old ordination might have led them to expect. They were to be placed as Readers, who were not permitted to preach or administer the Sacraments. (3). And further, with respect to bishops of the Mediaeval Church, the Assembly would not allow them to be made Superintendents, except by proper appointment in the way prescribed by the

(1) Winset. "Tractates". No. 33.

(2) Calderwood. Vol. II. p. 206.

(3) Do. Vol. III. p. 297.

I. Apostolic Succession.

Book of Discipline, which was the same for all ministers.

There is an example of this in the case of Bishop Alexander Gordon, of Galloway. Laing writes of him- "In addition to these five Superintendents, the Assembly on the penult of June, 1562, refused the petition of Alexander Gordon, formerly Bishop of that diocese, to be ~~acknowledged~~ acknowledged as Superintendent of Galloway. In Decr. following, he was again put in nomination, with Superintendents for Aberdeen and other places, but the haill Kirk remitted this to further advisement. "Here", Calderwood remarks, "we may see that the Bishops converted from Poperie, were not suffered to exerce jurisdiction ecclesiasticall by virtue of their Episcopall Office.""(1).

Even in the appointing of the "Tulchan" bishops there was utter disregard of any "Succession". All the supposed important elements in the Apostolic Succession theories, were either neglected or violated. Which shows that neither civil rulers nor churchmen, at that time, were concerned about these things.

Further, the Reformed Churches, by their very polity, with the doctrine of the equality of ministers, show that they quite set aside, and turned away from, any theory of "transmission" or "conveyance" of a peculiar and mysterious Apostolic "quality" in the Ministry by means of prelatic bishops. Some in England of the Stuart period divines of the Church of England, with a wasted charitableness and attempted broadmindedness, were inclined in a measure to excuse and countenance the
(1) Laing's Knox. Vol.VI. p.387.

I. Apostolic Succession.

ordinations of the Reformed Ministry, on the ground, as they affirmed, that such ordinations were due to a necessity from the want of bishops. In this strain writes one- "It seems they could not get properly consecrated bishops (to ordain for them) ~~without~~ without abandoning principles still more important." (1) These views, which were meant to be charitable, were mistaken. France and Scotland, at any rate, could have worked in a "succession" on the lines of a prelatial episcopal "transmission" theory, equally as easily as England. The Reformed Church of France had at least one who had been a Papal bishop, serving faithfully within its borders. He made an excellent minister. (2) There may have been others. Had the Reformation Church of Queen Elizabeth's establishment more? And Scotland was not without one or more Papal bishops who had wished to throw in their lot with the Reformed Church. But for these Reformed Churches to have used these sometime Papal bishops to try and set up a "succession", or even with a thought of them being suitable ordaining agents, ^{would have been} ~~was/so~~ contrary to their beliefs and doctrines about the Ministry. It was not because they had no previously Papal bishops to carry through ordinations for them, that they had ordination by other agents, but because they rejected the theories of ordination and "succession" of the Papal Church.

Later than the first period of the Reformation, in Scotland and England it is the same. James VI. & I. had had bishops created for Scotland according to the English "succession". As soon as Reformed Churchmen had again power in the

(1) Mason. "The Church of England and Episcopacy". Quotations on pp. 155, 185, 265, 268, 269.

(2) ~~Beza~~ Beza. "Histoire Ecclesiastique. Vol. II. p. 96.

X. Apostolic Succession.

Church of Scotland, they abolished these prelatie bishops. This was done most resolutely at the Glasgow Assembly of 1638, and the following Assembly of 1639. And in England soon after, prelatie bishops were abolished. The Westminster Assembly, although composed of men ordained by the prelates, in striving to arrange the Church order and polity, ^{which might be the same} for the Churches ~~for the~~ of both England and Scotland, never thought of introducing any "succession" which might have been brought about by the former bishops. On one occasion they censured a candidate for the Ministry for having gone away to one of the deposed bishops to be ordained.(1).

It would have been very remarkable, however, if some lingering ideas of a "transmission" or "conveyance" theory in the ministry, had not still been found among, perhaps a majority of, the members of the ^{Westminster} Assembly. For, good Reformed Churchmen as they were, they had not been able to be utterly unsusceptible to the ideas current in the Church of Archbishop Laud, in which they had been brought up and ordained. And so we do ^{perhaps} find something of the "transmission" idea in the regulation adopted for ordination- "Every minister of the word is to be ordained ----- by these preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong."(2). This possible tendency, however, is seen much more strongly in the pronouncements of the "High Church" Presbyterian Provincial Assembly of London, of 1654. There is expression given to a distinct "succession" doctrine. "Church-power is first seated in Christ the head, and from him committed
(1) Mitchell & Struthers. p.468.
(2) Westminster Asssemb. "Form of Church Government."p.586

X. Apostolic Succession.

to the Apostles, and from them to ~~Church~~ Church-Officers. And they alone who have received it from the Apostles can derive and transmit it to other ministers."(1). "That Ordination of Ministers by Ministers, is no Romish institution, but instituted by the Lord Jesus Christ long before Antichrist was. That our Ministry is descended to us from Christ through the Apostate Church of Rome, but not from the Apostate Church of Rome."(2). And again- "That the receiving of our Ordination from Christ and his Apostles and the Primitive Churches, and so all along through the Apostate Church of Rome, is so far from nullifying our Ministry, or disparaging of it, that it is a great strengthening of it when it shall appear to all the world; That our Ministry is derived to us from Christ and his Apostles by succession of a Ministry continued in the Church for 1600 years; And that we have, 1) a lineal succession from Christ and his Apostles, 2) Not only a lineal succession, but that which is more, and without which the lineal is of no benefit, we have a Doctrinal succession also."(3)

In considering these pronouncements, one has to bear in mind that these Reformed Churchmen, prelatie episcopally ordained, were defending their ministerial status against extremists of the Independents and others, who said that they were not lawful ministers at all, but derived their ministry from ~~Anti-~~^{Anti-}christ, because of their ordination in the late hierarchical

Church of England. Yet these views were somewhat of a departure

(1) "Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici" Pt.I. p.185.

(2) Do. Pt.II. p.33.

(3) Do. Do. p.45.

X. Apostolic Succession.

from the generally accepted Reformed Church position with regard to a "succession". ~~They~~ They belong^{to} that form of the "Transmission" Theory, previously described in these pages, which believes in a "transmission" from the Apostles through the main body of the Ministry, with or without prelates.

The Reformed Churches almost, if not quite, unanimously did not hold any "Conveyance-Transmission" Theory, not even that form of it which accepted a "transmission" through the main body of the Ministry. But they were ready to hold a kind of Apostolic Succession. It was one they could be sure of. It was a Doctrinal Succession. The London Provincial Assembly, 1654, was coming back to a true Reformed position when it declared for its ~~the~~ ministry, that it had "not only a lineal succession, but that which is more, without which the lineal is no benefit, we have a Doctrinal Succession also." There is the doctrine of the Ministry of the Word asserting itself again. The Reformed Churches believed in a "doctrinal succession" for that could agree well with their doctrine of preaching being the constituting element of the true Ministry. This "Doctrinal Succession" was not a transmission of Apostolic Doctrine from predecessor to successor. It was rather a succession of the "Series" type, and yet not of a series of men in the same office and place as the Popes of Rome claim. It was a series of all the men in the official ministry of the Church, which itself in some form or another had existed from the earliest times of the Church to the latest, who held forth the same Word of God, deriving it, not each from his predecessor till the Apostles were reached, but from Christ

X. Apostolic Succession.

and the Apostles, and by means of the Scriptures. Every true Minister of the Word formed the "Series" stretching as a long line from the earliest to the latest times. The following quotations may give some warrant for what has just been said. Balnaves, in 1543, writes recognizing something of this "Succession"- "The succession of the Church is far otherwyse (than the Papal Church way), the which requireth you to have knowledge in the Scriptures of God, to preache and teache the same, with the other qualities and conditions conteined in the Scriptures, as hereafter shalbe shoven in the speciall vocatiounis; Of the which, if ye be expert, and your vocation lawfull, according to the Worde of God, doubtles ye are the successors of the Apostles, and have the same authority they had committed to them by Christ. And, if ye want the saide conditions and qualities, (Here John Knox, as editor, puts in the margin the words- "Note Wel," which shows he is agreeing with Balnaves), yee are but reaving wolfes, clede with shepe skinnes, what authoritie that ever the Bishop of Rome give you.-----Therefore, I pray you learne the Scriptures, that ye may walke in your vocatioun right: For of ypur succession yee have no more matter to glorie, than the Jewes had to glorie against Christ, calling them(selves) the sonnes of Abraham, whom he called the sonnes of the Devill. They gloried in the carnall succession, and ye glory in the politike or ceremoniall succession, and all is one thing."(1). Beza, at the conclusion of the following, seems to be adhering to the same views of a succession by the

(1) Laing's Knox. Vol.III. p.460.

I. Apostolic Succession.

preaching of the Word- "As for that succession wherein some ~~set~~ set all their succour, it has ceased long ago to have any force of value (Beza is thinking, as usual, of the corruptions in the Papal hierarchy being sufficient to destroy any succession there, if there ever was one.), seeing this is most certain, that the most ignorant and wicked men have been the successors for many years unto the good and learned bishops, and that there doth appear no step or token of any lawful vocation in the churches now for a long season; furthermore we do require a succession of doctrine, not of the persons, even of the prophetic and apostolical doctrine, so that of necessity we must run again to the books of Prophets and Apostles, for the proof of the true succession."(1). This kind of Apostolic Succession is what is brought out by John Knox in answering the Jesuit, James Tyrie, who had challenged the Reformers to show the Succession in their Church. Knox first of all affirmed that the Church, "the immaculate spous of Jesus Christ", was not in bondage to any succession, and, in fact, did not depend on that but on the Gospel. Christ sends not the afflicted to seek "a lineal succession". He has the words- "Come unto Me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will ease you." And he quotes the words from Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians- "Now therefore ye ~~are~~ are no ~~more~~ moir strangers and foraners, but citizens with the sanctis and of the household of God: and ar builded upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophetes, Jesus Christ himself

(1) Beza. "An Exhortation to the Reformation of the Church", 1565, included with "A Confession of Faith &c.

X. Apostolic Succession.

being the ~~chief~~ cheaf corner stone" ----- And Knox goes on-
"Heir we find men, who befoir were strangers, maid ~~cit~~ cietizens with the saincts and of the household of God; we find them buylded upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets: we find Jesus Christ to be the cheaf corner stone- but we find no mention of any sic succession as Maister Tyrie seameth rigorously and without Godes commandment to crave. And therefoir we cannot but wonder, why that mortall man should crave of us that which nether God the Father, his sone Christ Jesus, nether yet the holy Apostles in their ministerie craved of any Realme or Nation. And therefoir lat Maister Tyrie tak this for an answer: That an unjust request may justlie be denied."

And then he goes on- "And yet lest that the wryter, or any other, should think themselves rather mocked than answered, we ade (add) to the premises, That we are able to shaw the succession of our Kirk directly and ~~lawfully~~ laughfully to have flowed from the Apostles. And our reason is, because that in our Kirkis we nether admit doctrine, ryte nor ceremonie, which be their (the Apostles') wrytingis we find not authorised. And albeit that this shall not satisfie the new start^{up} Jesuites, yet our consciences are at rest, becaus we are assured to be avowed of the Supreme Judge."(1). This last which Knox asserts is, that the succession in ^{his} ~~their~~ Church is seen in a receiving and holding forth of Apostolic Doctrine alone; his Church is in the succession of the doctrine which comes from the Apostles.

In the above we notice that Knox affirms that the most
(1) Laing's Knox. Vol.VI. pp.697,698.

X. Apostolic Succession.

important feature for the Church and Ministry is not any "succession" as supposed in the theories, but the Gospel of Christ. He and other Reformed Churchmen of like opinion were on safe ground for this position. And they were right too when they recognized there was an Apostolic Succession as a possession of the Church and seen in the preaching Ministry at least, a Succession which is made up of a series of men who have received the Apostolic Doctrine, and hold it forth. It is a "Series" of men, all in continuous line from the Apostles' days, who have received and held the Doctrine, not receiving it so much in the way of it being passed on to them like a tradition, but as far as possible obtaining it from the original source for themselves. This is a kind of Succession which is not vulnerable as the other supposed Successions would be. The Succession which is supposed to be constituted by a "transmission" from predecessor to successor of some mysterious unknown apostolic "quality" is discredited and annulled if there are unworthy members of the chain, and will be quite destroyed if some of the formal links drop out by heresies or disregard of the supposed correct forms. This Apostolic Succession which is made up of a Series of receivers and preachers of the original Apostolic Doctrine can never be broken in such ways. From the very nature of it, actual heretics and men of evil life never get into the "Series", and if any in it might fall away, they would automatically drop out of it without impairing the "Series." It will be a Series, perhaps, with varying spaces between those forming the line of it. Yet we may believe that probably the

X. Apostolic Succession.

spacing in the Series has not been at any time very wide, although the outward aspect of some centuries and periods might lead us to suppose so. Every generation and age has had its members of the Series. There have always been, from the time of the Apostles, receivers^{of} and witnesses ~~of~~ for the Apostolic Doctrine, at times more numerous than at other times, but always there, and the Series might be well known and marked, standing out right down from the earliest to the latest Christian times.

Along with this idea of "Succession" or "Series" containing those possessing and proclaiming the original Apostolic Doctrine, there was the belief in the Reformed Churches that there always had been, and would be, a recognized office of the Christian Ministry. As we have seen, it was to be a preaching Ministry. That it had not, always been. The continuing Ministry from the time of the Apostles had assumed different forms. The effort of the Reformed Churches was to be, to try to secure that those in the continuous Ministry should be preachers, whose preaching properly would be in accord with the Apostolic Doctrine. If every ^{minister} ~~preacher~~ could be one of that kind it would place all in the great "Series" or "Succession" from the Apostles' time. In an imperfect world this would not be likely to be fully realized. But it would be a great ideal to strive to reach, that the continuous official preaching Ministry in all its members would coincide with the "Series" or "Succession" of the preachers of the Word of the Truth of the Gospel of which the first in the "Series" were the Apostles.

XI. Validity.

With those who are persuaded that a Ministerial Order is necessary and essential to the Christian Church, as we have seen the Reformed Churches were, and as almost all distinct Christian Communion have been, the question of what is a right and proper Ministry, in view of the fact that differing types of ministry are found with their claims to be true ministerial orders, is an important one. The right and proper ministry, so described, is a rough and ready naming of what in more ecclesiastical phrasing is called a Valid Ministry.

We can take it for granted that, if there is a right Christian Ministry, or more than one, most likely there will be wrong ones claiming to be Christian Ministries too. That is the way of the world. And without doubt, not only have wrong Orders of Ministry been possible, they have existed, and such do exist, in connection with the Christian Church in its varied right or wrong developments in the world. In the history of the Church it ~~is~~ can be noticed, if any Ministry was supposed to be heretical, it was judged to be wrong or invalid. And if any section of the Church became schismatic or heretical, the whole Ministry of that section had to be regarded as wrong and invalid.

The question of the rightness or validity of Ministries became acute in Western Christendom when the great breaking off from the Mediaeval Church took place at the time of the Reformation. Of course the Papal Church denied the rightness or validity of any Ministries but its own. The Churches of the

XI. Validity.

Reformation were just as ready to deny the rightness and validity of the Ministry of the Papal Church. All were moved to put forward their claims for their own ministries. And when claims for an Anglican type of ministry were introduced into the controversy, the whole question was made more complicated. Questions as to Validity with regard to differing ministries are still today acute, and opposing claims are asserted almost as strongly as ever.

In trying to define this matter of Validity in a Ministerial Order more precisely, we may say that, as generally thought of, it includes two notions, that of lawfulness and that of efficaciousness. There are these two aspects of it, lawfulness and efficaciousness. The valid Ministry will be one which will be both lawful and efficacious. In fact, it should be said, these two are not mere aspects of the Ministry, they are two elements, but they are elements which are closely connected and intertwined, and are made to be interdependent more or less. We can, however, in some degree, examine the two aspects or elements separately. In doing so it will be necessary to go over some matter which has been given before because of its bearings on these subjects.

We first examine the element of lawfulness. It seems to have been generally accepted that this depends on the authorisation. The valid Ministry, so far as lawfulness is concerned, depends on being authorised by the right persons in the right way. The right authorisation will give the ~~minister~~ minister or ministry lawfulness for the exercise of the Ministerial

XI. Validity.

Office.

Accordingly we notice that in the Papal Church it was held that that Ministry was lawful, and alone lawful, which was authorised and conferred by the bishops who were in connection with the Papal See. The lawfulness was obtained by being conferred by bishops supposed to be in a "transmission" succession from the Apostles, and specially were in actual connection with, and in obedience to, the supposed successors of the Apostle Peter in the Roman See. Moreover, Ministerial Order was taught to be a sacrament, and it was claimed that the only persons who could act as agents in the sacrament were Papal Bishops. Consequently, although there may be claims of an Apostolic Succession for other Ministries, with laying on of hands by bishops in what is claimed to be a "transmission" succession, all will be insufficient. There must be the connection with, and obedience to, the See of Rome. Besides, the Papal Church maintained that the only lawful ministry which could be, must be a sacrificing priesthood. If it were not a priesthood, it was no ministry at all. Only the Papal bishops could confer that priesthood. This was the only lawful Ministry, one which was composed of those who were priests, made so by Papal bishops.

The Anglo-Catholics hold that a ministry is only lawful when it is conferred by prelatial bishops, who are in the "transmission" succession, as they suppose, from the Apostles. None have the right to exercise the office of the ministry except those who are brought into the Ministry by the ordination

XI. Validity.

of these bishops. They believe that their bishops are of this kind who can authorise a lawful ministry, and it may be added, they also recognise that bishops of the Church of Rome, of the Old Catholics, Greek Church, Church of Sweden, and perhaps some others, are on the same footing.

Differing much from such views, the Reformed Churchmen took up other ground. A lawful minister was to be one who was duly "called". In the "calling", we have seen, there were included examination or "trials", and election, and reception or admission or ordination. This "Public Call" in all its procedure was really the Church's authorization of candidates to be in the Ministry. And the lawful ministry was that alone which came from such authorizing. This Ministry had a "Jus Divinum". It had an authorization which was based on divine authority. The Reformed teachers professed to find in the Scriptures that this was the kind of Ministry which ^{had been} instituted by Christ and His Apostles. On the ground of the necessity of the right "call" (the Church's due authorising) they denied the lawfulness of the Ministry of the Papal Church. Along this line Calvin affirmed that the appointment of the Papal bishops was invalid, because there was not in it one of the most important elements of the "Call", the election of the people. He uses in support of his contention the teaching of antiquity- "Then in election, the whole right has been taken from the people ----- Cyprian after declaring it to be of Divine authority, that election should not take place without the consent of the people, shows that such a procedure (that of depriving the people ^{of} their part) is at

XI. Validity.

variance with the word of God. ~~Moreover~~ Numerous decrees of Councils most strictly forbid it to be otherwise done, and if done, order it to be null, If this is true, there is not throughout the whole Papacy in the present day, any canonical election in accordance either with divine or ecclesiastical law."(1). Beza held the same views. One of his biographers tells us- "He retorted with quiet but effective irony to an ill-timed speech made at the last Session (of the Colloquy of Poissy) by a Roman Catholic theologian, Claude d'Espense, who endeavoured to show that the Protestant ministers were intruders, who had assumed their office without a proper "call". "What", asked Beza, if a bishop were to ask a Reformed Pastor his authority for undertaking to preach and administer the sacraments, and were to be met with the counter-question: Were you elected to the episcopate by the elders of your church? Did the people seek for you? Were inquiries instituted regarding your conduct, your life, your belief ----"(2). There we have the same demand for the examination or "trial", and the election, including that of the people, as essential for a lawful ministry. Beza, too, when writing in reply to enquiries from English Reformed Churchmen about ^{what they considered were} the irregularities in ministerial appointments in the English Church, where men were put into charges "without the legitimate vote of any body of presbyters, and after a very slight examination into their life and morals", said among other things- "We reply that calls

(1) Calvin. Inst. Bk.IV. Chap.V.1.

(2) Baird. "Theodore Beza". p.195.

XI. Validity.

and ordinations of such a kind by no means appear to us to be lawful, whether we look at the express word of God or the more pure among the Canons."(1).

In relation to Anglican claims, we notice what attitude the English Reformed Churchmen in Elizabeth's reign took up in view of the hierarchic ministry of the English Church of those days. In the "Admonition" of 1571 we have- "Although it must be confessed that the substance of doctrine by many delivered is sound and good, yet here it faileth, that neither the ministers thereof are accordyng to Gods worde, proved, elected, called, or ordayned."(2). There again we have the demand that for a lawful ministry there must be "trial", election, admission or ordination, the public "call", in other words, what was the procedure in the due authorisation of the Church. To take another testimony, in 1570, a Puritan named Axton, who was being examined before the Bishop of Litchfield, confessed his convictions, and among other things ~~said~~- "He tells the bishop that he (the bishop) is not lawfully called to the ministry for these reasons, 1) He had not the laying on of the hands of the Eldership (presbytery, perhaps); 2) He was not ordained to a single congregation, but was over a whole diocese-- 3) He was not "chosen to be a governor of the Church of God by the election of the people", according to Acts XIII.23.(3). And he went on to show how his ministry was more lawful, for he had been "examined" and "tried". Again ~~there is~~ there is in this Puritan's

(1) Baird. "Theodore Beza". p.264.

(2) "Puritan Manifestoes". p.9.

(3) "Seconde Parte of a Register". Vol.I. pp.70,71.

XI. Validity.

views about the bishop's and his own ministry the persuasion seen, that "trial", election, and ordination, are necessary for the lawful ministry.

The Reformed Churchmen acted on this principle, that it was the due procedure of the "call", its examination, its election, its admission or ordination, of candidates for the Ministry which made them lawful ministers. Papal Church ~~ordination~~ appointing, neglectful of the essentials, did not count for a lawful ministry, nor hierarchical church appointments, as in the ~~English~~ English Church, did not count, nor "transmission" successions. When Winzet attacked Knox, and asked- "Give Johne Knox be not lauchfull Bischope quhow can they (the superintendents and ministers) be lauchfull ordinatit be him ?"(1), Knox's reply was- "I ordinat nane superintendentis nor ministeris." The lawfulness of their ministry did not depend on what he was, one way or another. He did not trouble to tell Winzet that the lawfulness of the ministry of the superintendents and ministers did not, according to his belief, ^{depend} ~~was not dependent~~ on such "bischopes" as Winzet thought to be "lauchfull". As for himself, at the solemn setting apart or ordination, ^{the most} ~~all~~ that he had ~~done~~ done, in the case of any, had been to preside as Moderator or leading minister. The lawfulness of the ministry of those in question depended on that solemn setting apart and all the procedure of the "Call" which led up to it, and of which it was the culminating part. There is no need to go further into this here, as it has been already fully considered.

(1) Winzet. "Tractates". Questions, 33, 34.

XI. Validity.

To sum up this part of the discussion, it can be said that the lawfulness of the Ministry according to the doctrine of the Reformed Churches, in contradistinction from the doctrines of the Papal and Anglican Churches, depended on that authorisation which was in the "Public Call". All other authorisations only produced an unlawful ministry. And that "Public Call", in all its procedure, was really the careful and public authorising of men for the Ministry by the Church. This is not always clearly recognized. Because of the variety of ways of carrying out the several parts of the procedure of the "Call", the actual authority by which a candidate is made a minister is obscured. There it was, however, in actuality the public authorising of men for the ministry by the Church. That gave the lawfulness.

It is to be carefully noted that this authorisation came from the Church, and not from a congregation or local church, as the Independents contended was right. The Reformed Churchmen never had that view of the matter as the Independents had. The minister was, as we have before noticed, usually to be appointed to a charge, to be placed as minister of a particular church or parish or congregation. And the people of that charge were to have their part in his election. But it was not a congregation in its independence and isolation which elected and authorised a minister. There were always to be some others who took part representing the Church as a whole; either as electors, as was the case when representatives of the Church-State in a Swiss City Council had to do with the electing; or in the actual admission into the Ministry by solemn setting

XI. Validity.

apart and ordination, with or without imposition of hands, which was carried through by delegated ministers, or Colloquies, or Synods, or Presbyteries, or Classes, or Assemblies, all of which stood for the Church as a whole. And the people of the very charge which might elect a man to the Ministry of their own church, were not a mere independent congregation, but were a part of the whole Church, and in their electing had to be regulated by the principles and polity of the whole Church, and thus were in a measure acting as representative of the Church as a whole. The authorising of candidates for the Ministry was always in essence the authorising by the Church, for they were to be ministers with respect to the whole Church and not to be with respect to a mere independent congregation.

It is interesting to notice that this matter came up in the Westminster Assembly. There the Reformed Churchmen had to maintain their position against the tenets of the Independents who held that the authorising of a minister came from an independent congregation. Consequently such a minister was only a minister with respect to that congregation alone. Strictly such a minister when he went elsewhere was not a minister at all, for each independent congregation could not impose its acts, in the way of authorising a man as a minister, or in any other matter, upon other equally independent congregations. Such a man, made a minister in one congregation, had to be made afresh a minister in another congregation if he went to a new charge. Even if he took occasional services elsewhere, strictly in theory he was not a minister except in his own church, though in practice

XII. Validity.

he would be recognized as such, and in effect that came to making him a minister in another church for the time being. But if he ceased to be recognized by any congregation, he ceased to be a minister, for his ministry depended entirely on an independent congregational connection. The Reformed Churchmen in the Westminster Assembly opposed such tenets which were practically destructive of the Ministerial Order, which put in ~~the~~ place of a Church Ministry, acting with all the lawfulness that the Church had the right to bestow, a class of congregational preaching officials with uncertain position at any time. Thus it was debated in the Assembly- "No single congregation may ordinarily assume to itself all and sole power in ordination." That was practically what the Assembly resolved on.(1). Gillespie, in the course of the debate, had pointed out reasons why a ~~man~~ minister must not receive his authorisation from a single congregation, and among them was this- "It is not res propria to that congregation, but common to many, since he is to be a member of the Classis."(2). He might have gone further and said, since he is to be a member of the Ministry of the whole Church. Each candidate had to be authorised by the Church as a whole, because he was to be in the Ministry of the whole Church. The London Provincial Assembly, 1654, pronounced clearly on this point. In arguing that too much must not be attributed to the congregation's vote in the making of a minister, and that ordination, in which this Assembly seemed to see the act of the whole Church, must count for very much, affirmed- "Because every Minister hath

(1) West. Assemb. "Form of Church Government". p.585.

(2) Gillespie. West. Assemb. p.60.

XI. Validity.

a double relation, one to the Church Catholique indefinitely, another to that particular congregation over which he is set."(1).

So again we repeat - The Reformed Church doctrine of the Ministry was that it was a Ministry of the whole Church. It was made up of those who were authorised by the whole Church through its accredited representatives. The Church in its form and organization and polity, which ^{Reformed Churchmen} ~~they~~ held by, they were prepared to maintain, at the risk of their lives, was of Divine appointment. The Church which they belonged to was the True Church. They knew the notes or marks of the True Church, and it was their aim to make the Church they had to do with to conform entirely to those notes. Thus their Ministry authorised by this True Church could not fail to have full lawfulness, and so far as that goes, had Validity.

Anglo-Catholics have tried to differentiate between a Ministry, as they call it, which is "from above", and a Ministry which is "from below". Of course their view is that the Ministry of their Church is "from above". It is so because its authorisation is through the supposed "transmission" succession of their prelatial bishops, which carries the authorising back as coming through the Apostles from Christ. Ministries which are "from below" are apparently those which they think have had their authorisation from men. And they think that all ministries which are outside of conformity with their "transmission" succession theory, are of men, and so "from below". They do not seem to consider that there is just the possibility that their whole theory of "transmission" may ~~not~~ be of man's devising

(1) *Institutum A. E. Pt. I. p. 145.*

Xi. Validity.

and imagining, and so might be productive of a ministry which might be somewhat "from below". They would call a ministry which is authorised by the Church, as the Reformed Ministry is, as being "from below". Of course they would say that it is not authorised by the Church, for that only is the Church which is constituted by their prelatie "transmission" theory. One cannot go into the disputes as to the true Church here. The Reformed Churchmen felt certain of what constitutes the true Church. All their Confessions testify to that. And they believed they were of it. Granting here that they were right, surely ~~the authorising of~~ ^{authorised} a ministry by the Church would be as much "from above" as one authorised by "transmission" succession prelates, if not more so. If connection with Christ in the past is demanded in order to make the authorisation to come "from above", most certainly the true Church has that connection. It goes back continuously from the present to the event of its calling into being by Christ Himself. There is far more certainty in that continuous going back of the Church ~~to Christ~~ as a living organism to Christ than there is with regard to any of the supposed "Successions" with their gaps and irregularities and uncertain continuings. The being of the true Church has been too much supposed to depend on these unprovable formal Successions of prelates and others, while in reality it has consisted in the continuous organic succession of all believers. A Ministry authorised by the Church has that authorisation carried back by the Church which extends backwards to Christ so that the authorization may be said to be from Christ

XI. Validity.

in the past, if that were worth while. Would Anglo-Catholics say that was a ministry "from below" ? But further, there is that which is more worth while saying. The Church of the present has not only the unbroken connection with Christ in the past, it has its closer living connection with Christ in the present. So surely that must be an authorisation which will make a lawful Ministry which is that of the living Church in touch with the living Christ in the present. There can be nothing of "belowness" in that. And such the Reformed Church doctrine for the Ministry leads to, and its lawfulness can be made to depend on that.

We turn now to consider the other element or aspect of Validity for a Ministry, that is, efficaciousness. If anything, in dealing with this we come to closer grips with the subject than when discussing lawfulness in the Ministry.

What the necessary efficaciousness must be will depend on what the Ministry is supposed to be required to do. In the Papal Church what was chiefly required was, that those in the Ministerial Order would be able to offer the sacrifice of the Mass for the living and the dead. So it was a priesthood that was required. Nothing but a priesthood would be efficacious. And so no Ministry which was not of such a kind could be a valid ministry for the purpose. That is why the chief action in the ceremony of ordaining Papal priests was not the laying on of hands, but the giving of the chalice and paten, the "instruments" of the sacrifice of the Mass. As Aquinas says- "And since the principal act of a priest is the consecration of the body and blood of Christ, the priestly character is imprinted at the very

XI. Validity.

giving of the chalice under the prescribed form of words."(1). This conferring of the priesthood and its powers could only be effected by bishops who were in obedience to the Papal See. Only in that Church which had the ministration of the Papacy and its Bishops could that Sacrament of Ministerial Order be truly carried out by which men were made priests, efficacious to offer the Great Sacrifice. The Mass having a priesthood as its fundamental complement was declared by the Council of Trent- "Sacrificium, et sacerdotium ita Dei ordinatione conjuncta sunt, ut utrumque in omni lege exstiterit. Cum igitur in novo testamento sanctum eucharistiae sacrificium visibile ex Domini institutione catholica ecclesia acceperit, fateri etiam oportet, in ea novum esse visibile et externum sacerdotium, in quod vetus translatum est. Hoc autem ab eodem Domino Salvatore nostro institutum esse, atque apostolis, eorumque successoribus in sacerdotio, potestatem traditam consecrandi, offerendi, et ministrandi corpus et sanguinem eius, necnon et peccata dimittendi et retinendi, sacrae litterae ostendunt, et catholicae ecclesiae traditio semper docuit."(2). Thus the priesthood, conferred by Papal bishops, had the efficaciousness for the chief duties of the Ministerial Order, and its Validity appeared in that. And it was because of its efficaciousness in the supreme duties that its other ministerial duties could be validly performed. If we desire a plain statement on this point, a declaration by the Roman Catholic Archbishop and Bishops of the Province of Westminster provides us with one- "Next as (1) Aquinas. Summa. "Sacrament of Order". Q%/ Q. XXXVII.4. (2) C. of Trent. "De Sacramento Ordinis". Cap.I.

XI. Validity.

to our doctrine of the priesthood. Priest and sacrifice are correlative terms - with us at all events - and indeed with all nations, except in so far as your own Communion (the Anglican Church) may be an exception. A priest is one who offers sacrifice; and, as is the sacrifice, so is the priest. Since, then, our sacrifice is the sacrifice of the Mass, our priest is one appointed and empowered to offer up that sacrifice; one, therefore, who has received from God the power, by means of the words of consecration, to cause the Body and Blood of Christ to become present under the appearance of Bread and Wine, and to offer them up sacrificially. He may have other powers annexed to his office, as the power of forgiving sins; and he may be likewise charged with the duty of preaching the Word of God and exercising pastoral care over the people. But these other powers are superadded and consequent. They are very suitably annexed to the priesthood, but are not of its essence. The priest would not have been less a priest if they had been withheld from him, nor is he more a priest because our Lord has thought fit to communicate them to him. He is a priest solely because he has the office and power of effecting the Real Objective Presence on the altar of the true Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, and thereby offering Him up in sacrifice."(1).

It is plain, from all that has now been given, how the efficaciousness of the Papal Church Ministerial Order comes about, by having that Order a priesthood properly inaugurated thereto by bishops in the Papal obedience. And there is more than the

(1) The Cardinal Archbishop and Bishops. 1898.

"A Vindication &c." p.26.

XI. Validity.

efficaciousness in that, there is also the lawfulness, so that we have here the essentials which constitute the validity of the Papal Ministerial Order.

One can remark at this point, that it can be reasonably concluded, that if there is a Ministerial Order in a Church where there is no Sacrifice of the Mass, and no priesthood required for that, and where the Ministry has other purposes to serve, its efficaciousness will be of a different kind, and will be brought about by other means, and its very validity will be with respect to other concerns.

What was chiefly required of the Ministerial Order in the English Church with its Prelacy is not easily discerned. Perhaps there was no one duty which was a constituting essential as the offering of the Sacrifice of the Mass was in the case of the Papal Ministerial Order. If there was one duty which was regarded as most important, it may have varied from time to time. Anglo-Catholics of the present day would wish that the chief work might be considered the same as that of the priests of the Papal Church, the offering up of the sacrifice of the Mass. But with considerable cogency the Papal authorities point out that the Anglo-Catholic priests have no efficaciousness for that. They maintain that in the very first place there must be the declared "intention", by symbol and formula, in ordinations to the Ministerial Order, that those being ordained are meant to be priests with the powers for the Sacrifice of the Mass. And that "intention" is not to be found in the Anglican Ordinal. The Papal Church authorities point out that the words- "Receive ye

XI. Validity.

the Holy Ghost &c."- are not sufficient, and are not of the kind to produce the priesthood desired. And indeed, the Anglican Ordinal, in the main, shows the very opposite intention to that of creating a priesthood for the Mass. It was drawn up at a time when the Anglican Church was denying Mass and priesthood. "We have to deal not with a Catholic rite, or with one which though used by heretics and schismatics was yet drawn up and also used in days while yet they were in communion with the Catholic Church, but with a rite deliberately changed, from which all mention of that which is the very reason of the Church's ministry, namely the great and unbloody Sacrifice, has been expunged. We have to remember that the same authorities, calling themselves bishops of the Church, by whom this new rite was put forth, were at that very time engaged in the destruction of altars, in forbidding the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, in propagating Protestant heresies."(1). All this seems quite fair argument. Anglo-Catholic priests cannot claim that they as priests have been made efficacious for the Sacrifice of the Mass, when their rites of ordination do not profess to give them the power. Besides for other reasons one might be inclined to disbelieve in a validity of Anglican priests which would consist in an efficaciousness in producing the sacrifice of the Mass. The Mass, as we know it, ~~is an institution of the Papal Church~~ in Western Christendom, is an institution of the Papal Church. It is hardly likely that outsiders could ever have the right, the lawfulness, the efficaciousness, the validity, to produce the same. Without here saying whether the

(1) Barnes. "The Popes and the Ordinal". p.35.

XI. Validity.

Papal doctrines of the Mass are true or false, they are believed in the Papal Church, and they are connected with all the other claims of that Church, in fact bound up indispensably with them. The belief that for the Mass there is created the very body and blood of Christ to be a sacrifice for the living and the dead, will require in support of it the full "intentions" in ordinations, and all the sources and resources and forces of power which the Papal Church claims. It is useless for outsiders to attempt the fulfilment of this belief. What they produce is something different from what is believed in the Papal Church, and their only way of producing the same thing is by being authorised by the Papal Church in accordance with all its doctrines and beliefs affecting the matter. We can say, the Anglican Priest has no validity for the creation of the Roman Mass.

There is, however, only a section of the Anglican clergy which is desirous to have a validity to celebrate the Roman Mass or what might be thought to be the same, as the chief duty of the Ministerial Order. Most of the clergy are content to claim a validity which rests on their theory of apostolic succession, according to which they receive a mysterious apostolic "quality", and there is conveyed to them a general efficaciousness for the various duties of the Ministerial Office, which in some vague way, not discernible outwardly, makes ~~the~~ the performance of those duties of higher value. Even poor preaching by a preacher within the validity of their "Succession" will have more value than that of a ^{good} preacher outside it. Says one writer on the subject- "Yet it makes a vast difference to

Xi. Validity.

our attitude if we think that the preacher, however feeble, has the authority of an Apostolic commission (such the Apostolic Succession theory is supposed to give) to proclaim salvation. The very foolishness of his preaching may perhaps be part of the Divine plan for the saving of the world, and we shall expect what he says to be an instrument of salvation, and shall think that it is either his fault or ours if there seems to be no "gospel" in his message."(1). It looks as if all the very bad preachers might be the better of this "Apostolic commission."

But it is in particular with regard to the Holy Communion, or Eucharist as many Anglican clergy prefer to call this Sacrament, that their "apostolic succession" efficaciousness is believed to make all the difference. It is because of it that the Communion is believed to be a real and proper Sacrament, without which it would not be Christ's true Sacrament at all, and with it the Sacrament has in it, at the very least, what is spoken of as "the real Presence", which means less or more according to the beliefs of individuals or ~~parties~~ parties.

When we come to the Ministerial Order of the Reformed Churches, we can notice that, like the Papal Ministerial Order, it has one feature which is central. The central feature of the latter is the offering of the sacrifice of the Mass for the living and the dead, and that requires a priesthood. The central feature of the former is the presentation of the Word, and that requires a preacherhood. A priesthood offering the Sacrifice of the Mass is the constituting essential of the Papal Church

(1) K.D.Mackenzie. "The Case for Episcopacy." p.3 et seq.

XI. Validity.

Ministerial Order. A preacherhood presenting the Word is the constituting essential of the Reformed Church Ministerial Order. And like as other duties are assigned to the Papal ~~Ch~~ priest, and are consequent on, and gain their value from, him being a priest of the Mass, so also other duties belong to the Reformed minister and gain their value from him being a preacher of the Word. The very value of the Sacraments was held to depend on them being administered by a duly authorised preacher of the Word. We have noticed that only ministers were allowed to administer the Sacraments, and that was because they were the preachers. It is according to such a belief that Gwalther, in a letter to Bishop Cox, of Augt. 1573, can write as follows- "I do not think that the Lord's Supper, which is a public act of the whole Church, appointed as a memorial and setting forth of the death of Christ, can be rightly administered without being preceded by a godly discourse, in which the congregation are admonished both of the benefit derived from Christ, and also of their corresponding obligations."(1). Knox regards the preaching qualification as being the great validity-giving feature. Writing to Mrs. Lock in 1559, who apparently had been attending English Church sacraments, he says- "But consider, Sister, what I have affirmed, to wit, that wher Christ Jesus is not preached - marke well that I say, preached - that there hath the Sacrament neither life nor soule; and farther, that I say, none can be a lawful minister of Christ's Sacrament, who first is not a minister of his blessed word."(2). So early as that in his

(1) Parker Society. Zurich Letters. 2nd. Series. p.225 et seq.
(2) Laing's Knox. Vol.VI. p.14.

II. Validity.

career as a Reformer was Knox holding these views. The English Reformed Churchmen had the same. Cartwright, in debating with Whitgift, was criticising the appointing to be incumbents of churches men who were unable to preach and could only read prayers, and perhaps some Scripture passages. He says-"For, although it might be granted - which thing I would not deny, no not when there are enough sufficient ministers - that they may appoint some godly grave man which do nothing else but read to be a reader in the church, yet that may not be granted that they may make of one that can do nothing but read, a minister of the Gospel, or who may have power to minister the sacraments."(1). We have already noticed that the "Form of Church Government" put forth by the Westminster Assembly, and the "Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici", of the London Provincial Assembly, 1554, connected the rite of ordination with preaching presbyters. Indeed one may refer back to all that has been pointed out previously in these pages with regard to the Ministry being essentially an Order of Preachers in the Reformed Churches, and the varied duties of the Ministry being rightly performed by those in it because of them being preachers.

With regard to the doctrines and practices related to the validity claimed for certain Ministerial Orders, there is a semblance, at least, in them of superstition and "magic". One can say such will not be found in the doctrines and practices of the Reformed Churches, which have to do with the validity of their Ministerial Order. The connection between

XI. Validity.

preaching and efficaciousness for the Ministry can be quite a natural one. The Sacraments are better administered when there is the word of interpretation, instruction, and exhortation given, as can only be given by the preaching ministry. This will be the thought in the mind of Gwalther when, in the passage previously quoted, for the observance of the Lord's Supper, he would have "the congregation admonished," and the Sacrament preceded by "a godly discourse". Without the Word the Sacraments are liable to degenerate into a mere ceremonial of material things, or to fall so far as to become little better than fetishes. And so, apart from the necessity of strict good order and right authorisation in such matters, the authorised preaching minister can most fitly administer the Sacraments with accompaniments of the setting forth and applying of the Word of God. And so also the same in other ministerial duties. Take for example that of Ordinations. There is to be the suitable application of the Word along ~~with it~~ with it. *This all the Reformed "divine offices" of ordinations provide for.* This is why the authorised preaching minister, according to the "Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici", is to perform the rite of ordinations- "But Imposition of hands is to be always by Preaching Presbyters, and the rather, because it is accompanied with Prayer and Exhortation, both before, in, and after, which is the proper work of the Teaching Elder."(1). And in the work of the Visitation of the Sick, and in the Visitation of the prisoners in the prisons, so particularly assigned in the "Ordonnances" of Geneva, of both 1541 and 1576, as part of the

(1) "Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici." Pt.I. p. 182.

XI. Validity.

duty of ministers, "consoler en Dieu par sa Parole" those who are sick, also with "admonition ou doctrine, laquelle lors est à l'homme plus nécessaire et salutaire que jamais;" and for these in the prisons, to make "quelque remontrance aux prisonniers pour les admonester et exhorter"; the authorised preaching ministers, having the Word in their heads and their hearts, will most efficaciously engage in these ministrations. As a Papal priest will convey the Host about with him, so the Reformed ~~Preaching Ministry~~ ^{Minister} conveys the Word wherever he goes in his ministrations, and in that way is efficacious in the Ministry. Thus it is a quite natural connection between the efficaciousness in the Ministry, which is an element of Validity, and the Preaching Minister. It has nothing of superstition or magic in it. In fact it is quite otherwise. This qualification of being a preacher of the Word to give efficaciousness in the Ministry is a destroyer of superstitious and magical tendencies in religion. The whole of the ministrations are capable of being interfused with the Divine Word. So it will be with regard to all duties and operations and activities. And with the Divine Word there will come forth the working of the Infinite Spiritual Divine Reason in the presence of which super-^{what}stition and magic cannot exist. This is ^{ought} to be the working always along with the preacherhood of the Word of the Reformed Churches. Unfortunately a finite human reason among those of the Ministry has not seldom been mistaken for the Infinite Spiritual Reason. A finite rationalism and human intellectualism has been only too common a tendency in the

XI. Validity.

Reformed Ministry. It was so in the 16th. and 17th. Centuries, and troubled the more Scriptural and Evangelic sections of the Ministry. They had to maintain, as there is always need of maintaining, that it is the being preachers of the Word of God of the Gospel, and a Ministry being interfused with the Infinite Divine Reason through that Word, and not finite human rationalism, which gives the Validity to the Ministry, to be seen in its efficaciousness for all that the Ministry stands for.

The Reformed leaders were very confident that they knew what the valid Ministry was. It certainly was not ⁱⁿ the Papal Orders. A validity which was bound up with a priesthood created for the Sacrifice of the Mass ^{was} rejected by them with their rejection of the Mass. Thus Knox, an ex-priest himself will ~~write~~ publicly speak- "O proude und pervers Prelatis and Preistis ! who gave you that authoritie (to offer a sacrifice in the Mass) ? Is it not expreslie forbidden by the Apostill Paule that any man suld usurpe the honour to mak sacrifice, except he be callit by God, as was Aaron? Have ye the same commandment as was gevin to Aaron ? His sacrifices ar abrogatit by Chryst. Let us heir whair ye ar ~~commandit~~ commandit to mak sacrifices."(1). It was not by a power or efficaciousness for the Mass that validity in the Ministry would be seen. But these priests were for the most part not preachers of the Word, and that was to be without real ministerial validity. Calvin has no great opinion of those priests who have no regular duties to perform, even if they are in full Papal

(1) Laing's Knox. Vol.III. p.60.

XI. Validity.

validity- "I briefly say, that it is the office of a presbyter - and this both the word of God prescribes, ICor. IV.1., and the ancient canons enjoin - to feed the church (Judging by the Scripture reference, Calvin is doubtless thinking of the preaching of the Word), and administer the spiritual kingdom of Christ, all those priests who have no work or stipend, save in the traffic of masses, not only fail in their office, but have no lawful office to discharge."(1). They have no lawful office in the Church of Christ, that was the opinion held about a section of the Papal priesthood, even if not of all. One can notice that in the early days of the Scottish Reformation, Church Mediaeval priests were not considered as having validity to baptise. So at the Assenbly of Decr. 1565, it was enacted- "If baptisme be administrat be ane papist preist, or in the papisticall maner, salbe reiterat."(2). This was going far in discounting the old priesthood and at the same time being assured in the validity of the baptising by the Reformed Ministry. This is just another example of the way the priests of the Papal Church were regarded, as we have noticed in a previous chapter. They were regarded as less suitable to be ministers, and had to be admitted with great care, and not till they had been practically re-ordained according to the procedure of the Reformed Church. All this goes to show that the Reformed Churchmen thought that their Ministry had, at least, a superior validity over that of the Papal Church Ministry.

(1) Calvin. Inst. Bk.IV. Chap.V.9.

(2) Univ. Kirk. Vol.I. p.75.

II. Validity.

Before coming to the concluding part of this chapter there is one point that has to be ~~touchd on~~ touched on, and that is ^{as} to ~~possible~~ possible limitations of Validity in the Ministry. Can the validity of a minister in his duties be lessened or annulled by what he may be, or may become, in his own personal life or character? A question of this kind arose in the Middle Ages with regard to the Papal Priesthood. Not a few in the office were unworthy men. When the evil life of a priest was well known, some of the people refrained from going to the Mass at which he officiated. The matter had to be dealt with. Pope Mildebrand (1073-1085) to try and stop the evils among the clergy, had forbidden the laity to attend on the ministrations of unworthy priests. This policy was found to bring on other evils, it would not answer, and had to be abandoned. Those having scruples about being under the ministrations of the unworthy were not regarded with favour. Dr. G.G. Coulton gives a story from the Exempla of Jacques de Vitry (13th. Cent.) which illustrates this- "I have heard how a certain woman, in her extreme simplicity would not receive the sacraments from unworthy priests, and that she did this not from settled malice, but from ignorance. God, wishing to recall her from her error, sent in her dreams a vehement and almost intolerable thirst; and it seemed to her that she was over a well, ~~whence~~ whence a certain leper drew water as clear as crystal, with a most comely vessel and golden cord. Seeing therefore that many went up and drank, she also came ~~forward~~ forward; but the leper withdrew his hand saying - Thou who

XI. Validity.

dost disdain to take the sacraments from evil priests, how wilt thou accept water from a leper's hand ? --- Most abominable therefore is the doctrine of the heretics who say that the (1) virtue of the sacraments hangeth upon the lives of the ministers." Later on, in the 14th. Century , in the movement which Wyclif set going, one of the doctrines was that it was the duty to abstain from the sacraments in the case of unworthy priests. This question had also to be dealt with by the Reformed Churches, for, unhappily, unworthy men got into their Ministry. The Second Helvetic Confession decided that the virtue of the Sacraments was there irrespective of the character of the minister- "Caeterum execramur in praesenti Donatistarum errorem, qui doctrinam et administratione sacramentorum, vel efficacem vel inefficacem, ex mala vel bona ministrorum vita aestimant. Scimus enim vocem Christi audiendam esse vel ex malorum ministrorum ore. Quando ipse Dominus dixit,- Quae dicunt, facite, secundum opera autem eorum nolite facere. Scimus sacramenta, ex institutione, et per verbum Christi sanctificari, et efficacia esse piis, ~~tamen~~ tametsi offerantur ab indignis ministris."(2). This statement deals not only with the validity of the sacraments in the cases where an evil minister is officiating, but also with the preaching of such a man- "Scimus enim vocem Christi audiendam esse vel ex malorum ministrorum ore." This may have been the wise position to adopt. It would not have done to allow the ~~sacram~~ sacraments to be considered to be invalid by reason of the evil life of a minister; it would have meant, say in the case of

(1) G.G.Coulton. "Life in the Middle Ages". Vol.I. p.32

(2) Niemeyer. p.511. et seq.

Xi. Validity.

a baptism, that the baptised person be baptised again. And it would not have been true to declare the words of ~~an unworthy~~ an unworthy minister to be of no value, if he delivered the Word of God. Even the devils spoke the truth about Christ when they cried out and said He was the Son of God. But probably the Reformed Churchmen were as well aware as we are, that in practice the ministrations of an evil minister lose greatly in ~~the~~ certain ways in spiritual effect. It was their aim to prevent the unworthy men entering the Ministry, and to put out those unworthy ones who were in.

We can now come to state briefly in what the Validity of the Reformed Ministry was supposed to consist and to be constituted. So far as lawfulness was concerned it has the authorisation of the Church. All the procedure of "trials", selection, election, admission, ordination, all that was included in the public "Call", was just the careful and considered and solemn authorising of candidates by the Church. And so far as efficaciousness was concerned, the constituting essential was the preaching of the Word. This then was the Validity of the Reformed Ministry, that it was a Preacherhood of the Word fully authorised by the Church, *that the True Church, which Reformed Churchmen claimed their church to be.*
Validity has its existence

This ^{is} clearly different from that of the Papal Priesthood and from that of the Anglo-Catholic Priesthood. It is obvious it does not require their supports. However much a validity for the priesthood of the Mass may require for its support the theories of a "Petrine Series" in the See of Rome and of a "succession" of lawful bishops, the validity of the Reformed Ministry has no

XI. Validity.

need of such. There are those who might think supports of this kind would be worse than useless. Luther said- ~~"Therefore those~~
"Therefore those who are ordained only for the purpose of reading the Canonical Hours and offering Masses are popish priests indeed, but not Christian priests, since they not only do not preach, but are not even called to be preachers; nay it is the very thing intended that a priesthood of this kind shall stand on a different footing from the office of preacher." ⁽¹⁾ Many Reformed Churchmen would be in agreement with Luther in all this. And again, however much a priesthood with a mysterious, indiscernible and indescribable, apostolic "quality", may require a theory of "succession" from the Apostles to support its Validity, the Validity of the Reformed Ministry has no need of this either. We can say that all such "Series" and "Succession" theories are simply an irrelevancy with regard to it. They would not make it, ~~if~~ ^{they could be proved} true for it; the absence of them, true or false, would not ~~annul~~ annul it.

There are those who try to find a support for the validity of the Ministry of the Church of Scotland in some "Succession" like that which is claimed for the Ministry of the Papal and Anglican Churches. The late Dr. Leishman in his article on the ~~"Ritual"~~ "Ritual of the Church of Scotland," appears to have had a wistful longing for a validity for his Church's Ministry derived in this way. He says in discussing the subject- "Those who are interested in this matter are concerned not about the validity of their orders (he is convinced they have a "Succession" to make them valid), but their nationality. They know that
(1) Wace & Buchheim. p.397.

II. Validity.

if it were necessary, they could fall back upon the English Succession, which was repeatedly blended with the Scottish in later times. To prelatical ordination as such they are indifferent, but it carries what they consider requisite, the transmission of the ministerial character, through presbyters. They have, however, neither wish nor need to derive their mission from Italy through Augustine or Canterbury. They claim to represent the Celtic Christianity of Scotland, having its probable origin from the East, the cradle of the faith."(1). There have been and are others writing with similar purpose to Dr. Leishman. It will be difficult for them to satisfactorily maintain their contentions to any except those who wish to believe them. They will appear quite unconvincing to redoubtable successionists in the Papal and Anglican Churches. Any attempts of the kind to trace for the Reformed Church Ministry some kind of a "transmission" or "conveyance" succession from the Apostles can hardly be successful in accordance with what is required by the usual theories. One will be met by too many "gaps" and disturbing and neutralising irregularities. And one will need to use too many conjectures and surmises and assumptions. It would be a sorry thing for the Ministry of the Church of Scotland if its validity had to depend on what could be made out in these tracings of "successions" either by way of Rome, Canterbury, Iona, or Jerusalem. It would reduce its validity to an almost more precarious position than the supposed validity in the Ministry of these other Churches, *and what it depends on is more than sufficiently precarious.* May we express the opinion that, after all, whatsoever of real

(1) Story. "The Church of Scotland; Past and Present".

Vol.V. pp.346-351.

II. Validity.
validity there is in these other Ministries, ^{depends on something other than what they suppose, and} comes from that which is very different ~~from that~~ ^{what} is contained in their "Series" and Succession" theories. Among whatever other factors there may be, it undoubtedly depends ^{in part} on the constitutional authorising of the Ministry and those in it by their respective Churches.

As for the Validity of the Reformed Church Ministry, it stands simply on the functioning of the living Church in authorising under Christ the Ministry, and men to be in it who will possess and present the living Word as revealed in Christ. This latter ~~is~~ element in the Validity, viz. the preachings, it may be noticed, are not a creation of the Church. A preacherhood of the Word cannot be created by the Church the same as it is supposed a priesthood of the Mass can be created; nor as a ministry with a mysterious "quality" can be made by a formal "transmission". All that the Church can do is to receive, and authorise and regulate preachers. The actual gift of preaching must come to each from God. There must be always something of the prophetic gift direct from God about the true preacherhood. The Reformed Church men looked for ^{and desired} such gifts as this for their Ministry. That they did so is expressed in their ordination prayers. We may take as an example that prayer provided in the "Forme and Ordour" of the Scottish Church, of 1561. So the petitions run- "Send unto this our Brother -- -- sick portioun of thy Holy Spreit, as thereby he may ryghtly devyde thy word to the instructioun of thy flocke, and to the confutatioun of pernicious errores, and damnable superstitiones.

XI. Validity.

Give unto him, gude Lord, a mouthe and wisdome, quhareby the enemies of thy truthe may be confounded, the wolfis expellit, and driven from thy fauld, thy scheip may be fed in the wholsom pastures of thy most holy word, the blind and ignorant may be illuminated with thy trew knowlege."(1). As another example there is the following from an ordination prayer in an ^{in Zürich} "Agenda" of 1675- "O Herr, ----- so bitten wir dich ----- das Gesetz der Treue und Wahrheit in seinen Mund legen, und ihm eine wohlgelehrte Zunge geben wollest, damit seine Lehre träufle wie der Regen, und seine Rede fliesse wie der Thau; dass er mit gesunden Speise deines heiligen Worts so geschicklich mit unerschrockenem Muthe und freudigem Eifer unsere Seelen also speise und weide, dass seine Sendung und Dienst bei uns sey ein Dienst der ~~Versöhnung~~ ^{Versöhnung} mit dir, durch welchen wir in deiner heilsamen Erkenntniss, im Glauben und in der Gottseligkeit wohl erbaut werden."(2). Thus it was understood that the minister's gift of preaching must come direct from God, and ^{so} was sought from Him. And thus we have to say that this element of the Ministerial Validity was direct from God.

To refer again to the attempts to find support for the Validity of the Reformed Ministry in "successions" and "transmissions," a more robust view, and one with more of the spirit of the Reformed Ministry about it, can be observed in the attitude towards a "succession" taken up by Alexander Vinet, of Lausanne, a devoted Reformed Churchman. He says- "In our National Protestant Churches our ministers are consecrated by other ministers,

(1) Laing's Knox. Vol.II. P.148.

(2) Daniel. Ex Agenda Turicensi. 1675. Vol.III. p.245.

II. Validity.

to which no objection can be offered. But this does not prevent our finding, if we trace back the consecration to its original sources, men who were not formally consecrated by others, but had consecrated themselves; - the right then of doing the same thing belongs to all."(1). Vinet probably has in mind Farel and Calvin, and others like them, who had no ritual ordination by other ministers, though they notably had had the Church's "call" virtually and actually, and were men who had devotedly consecrated themselves to the work of Christ in the Church.

We can think of Calvin with his consecration motto- "Cor meum velut mactatum Domino in sacrificium offero." Vinet is not afraid of a faulty "succession", if there be consecrated men.

One of the greatest dreads of those who depend for the validity of their Ministry upon some formal "transmission" succession, which to be worth anything according to their own theory must be perfect, a chain having an exact beginning and no missing or broken links, must be, lest there be some gaps or irregularities or breaks discoverable, sufficient to shake, if not to destroy all they have built on it. The Reformed Church has no need to fear for the true Validity of its Ministry whether that has any observable "succession" or is all gaps, if it can point to men who have consecrated themselves as making up its Ministry. The fulness of the Validity of the Reformed Ministry will stand in that, that the men who are in it have consecrated themselves. It is to such men the Word of God is revealed, and they are furnished with it to preach. Having them it is possible for the Church to authorise a true Preacherhood which will

(1) Vinet. "Pastoral Theology". p.41.

XI. Validity.

have the other element of Validity by being a preacherhood of the Word of God.

Not by seeking to establish, by theorising, some kind of "Succession," will the Reformed Church be most true to its principles, and assure itself of a valid Ministry, but by striving to bring^x about that ^{there} ~~it~~ shall be a consecrated Church authorising consecrated candidates as Preachers of the Word. The validity of the Reformed Ministry will never^{be} insecure if that is the state of affairs. It will be productive of an irresistible Validity far greater than can belong, say, to any "quality" supposed to come by "transmission" from the far past. There will be the living consecrated Church authorising a living consecrated Ministry, which will receive full consecration with power in Word and Work from the living Lord.

XII. Summing Up and Conclusion.

A notable fact about the Reformed Churches of the Reformation time and of the period following, was the wonderful agreement and uniformity ~~amongst~~ amongst them. Though settled in different lands and under a variety of governments, and their people speaking different languages, they had their main features much alike. In this respect they were somewhat different from the Lutheran Churches. The inner spirit of the Lutheran Churches might be the same, but outwardly in different lands they showed more variety of form and organization.

There were three main reasons for the agreement seen in the Reformed Churches. The first was, that the movement arose in one country, viz. Switzerland, and in that country, one city was particularly influential in the movement, viz. Geneva. The movement was led by commanding and devoted personalities, men of great ability, of much learning, immense zeal and spiritual power. And in that country, and under the influence and instruction of those great leaders, many, who became the leaders in the other countries, were trained, and served, what we may call, an apprenticeship. These became imbued with the spirit of the Reformed Church, and carried its ideals wherever they went.

A second reason of the agreement among the Reformed Churches was the continual intercourse and communication which they kept up between each other. The Confessions and Catechisms and Theological Writings of the several Churches circulated amongst all. Letters were frequently passing between the leading

XIII. Summing Up.

men. The Swiss leaders were often consulted by those trying to guide the affairs of the Reformed Church in other lands. One of the great and cruel hardships which a persecuting king and government inflicted on the French Church in the 17th. Century, was just in this, that the Church was prohibited from receiving messages from abroad.

The third reason of agreement was, that all the Reformed Churches accepted the same standard and authority and guide, and that was the Holy Scriptures. It was not only here they had their standard for doctrine, but they also found in the Scriptures what had to regulate them as regards church polity, order, discipline and worship. And this promoted agreement among the Churches particularly because they not only had the same Scriptures, but also a common interpretation of, and methods of using and applying the Scriptures. It has to be admitted that the proof texts they employed ~~in support~~ in support of their positions were not always relevant. They would be taken from any part of the Old or New Testament with insufficient discrimination. But in spite of a crude use of Scripture, there can be no doubt a fairly sound Scriptural Theology had been arrived at. The leaders of the Reformed Churches were not slaves of the letter. They in large measure got behind the letter and received the spirit of the Scripture message. If at times they misused individual texts, the great leading doctrines of the Scriptures had laid hold of their minds; the central truths of the Christian Faith were what they stood by. Even in their misuse of some texts, they were only seeking, mistakenly

XIII. Summing Up.

of course, to bring irrelevant passages into line with the leading truths which they had already grasped.

Along with all the Churches of the Reformation, the Reformed Churches held the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. Nobody could become more a priest under the Christian dispensation, than what every body became simply as a Christian believer. This was a departure from the Mediaeval Church doctrine and practice, and the Papal authorities strongly opposed the Reformers in this.(1). But the Reformers had quite relevant Scriptural authority for the doctrine (I Pet.II.5; Rev.I.6,10). And so their Ministerial Order was not a peculiar priesthood, and a priestly class apart from the rest of Christians. It was composed of a body of men who already as Christians had the priesthood of the only kind in the Christian Church. Their position in the Ministry only gave them the great privilege of large opportunity of exercising that common priesthood. Over the whole priesthood of all believers there was but one High Priest, the Lord Jesus Christ.

The Ministry of the Reformed Churches was accorded considerable power, both administrative and spiritual. It was part of the doctrine of the Church and of the Ministry that the Preaching Official must have rule and administration within the Church. To every member of the Ministerial Order in the Reformed Churches, there was given far more share in the ordering of the affairs of the Church than had ^{ever} been given to priests in the Mediaeval Church, and more than was given to ministers in

(1) C. of Trent. De Sacramento Ordinis. Cap.IV. p.135.

XII. Summing Up.

most of the other Churches of the Reformation which were more agreeable to secular control entering into Church affairs, *or had some form of a hierarchy.* As regards spiritual things, to the ministers, as being ministers of the Word, and chief executive of the Church, were specially applied the words-"Whosoever sins ye ~~retain~~ remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained." Though, as in the administrative work of the Church, the disciplinary part of the "Power of the Keys" was shared with lay-elders, in the preaching part, the whole of the exercising of the power was with the ministers, for they were the only accredited preachers.

The great principle of equality, an official equality, of all in the Ministerial Order, was held by the Reformed Churches. It was not only an equality of spiritual validity, as Roman Catholics and Anglo-Catholics hold with regard to the nature of the priesthood, that as priests all have the same priestly power. It was really an official equality, the recognizing that in the Ministry all have the same opportunity of taking part in the administration of the Church, and that there are no ranks and classes of higher and lower orders. This was a great contrast to the high and low official positions in the hierarchies. This principle or doctrine of equality the Reformed Churchmen could and did found on Scripture (Cf. Mtt. XX.27., Mk. X.44., Mtt. XX.25., Mk. X. 42., 1 Pet. V.1.)

Although, however, this principle of equality was held so strongly, it did not mean that there was no guiding and controlling ^{authority} over each and all, but that all equally having power

XII. Summing Up.

could do as they liked in the Ministry. There was order and governance and authority over every one, and each minister was to be subject to the same discipline. The control was to be exercised by the properly constituted church courts, to which all entering the Ministry bound themselves to be subject. And above all there was the Headship of Christ, which was no mere theoretical headship, but distinctly practical, the acknowledgment of it to be applicable in all the affairs of the Church and Ministry. Those of the Papal Church were ready to admit a headship of Christ, but it was exercised in heaven while the Pope was the acting head on earth. The Reformed Churchmen would have no human earthly head. This was their doctrine for the Church and the Ministry, that Christ was King and Head ruling, not only in heaven, but ruling actively on earth by His Spirit amongst His people with authority in all the detailed affairs of His Church. This was a doctrine held in the Reformed Churches with passionate devotion. It was often misunderstood by the secular authorities so that they thought the Church was setting up an authority which would be incompatible with their own, and doubtless at times the two authorities were bound to clash. Then there were persecutions of the church idealists by the civil powers. But those owning the Headship of Christ were ready to die for the claims of loyalty to Him. And their doctrine was not incompatible with the authority of any worthy secular rule, They were always ready to protest loyalty to any secular power, so far as they could under Christ, and under Him they would have made the best citizens of ^{a country ~~acount~~ with} a good secular government.

XIII. Summing Up.

In the admission of men to the Ministry, it was generally taught with some varying emphasis, that a ceremony of consecration was of considerable importance, and there was generally included in it a Scriptural symbolic rite of blessing, that is, the laying on of hands. This came as the final item in the most important and necessary procedure in admission of candidates for the Ministry, which included "trials" for fitness, and election, in which the people were to have some part, more or less. The whole embodied the public authorization by the Church of the candidates for the Ministry, with, in the solemn setting apart of them, the seeking for them the true consecration from God.

As for an Apostolic Succession, the Reformed Churches rejected the current theories of the Papal Church, and later also, the theories adopted by the Anglican churchmen. This did not prevent them being able to recognize a kind of "Series" or "Succession" of another kind, which was without any "transmission" or "conveyance" ^{of} a mysterious "apostolic quality". They knew the True Church was continuous from its beginnings from Christ. ⁽¹⁾ And ~~part~~ of that True Church, in spite of great corruptions in general in the Church and Ministry, faithful ministers of the Word had never wholly ceased. If God had not left Himself without a witness in the heathen world, the Reformers would feel they were justified in holding as a doctrine that still more certainly He had never left Himself without witnesses in the midst of that which claimed to be the Christian Church. These witnesses, confessors, and preachers, would form a "Series"

(1) Calvin - Tracts. Vol. III. p. 264.

XI. Summing Up.

not dependent on predecessors in the "Series" for their worth and value, but each and all being directly dependent on Christ, the author and perfecter of the faith and ministry. In this way all the injuriousness of drawing from a muddied or intermittent stream ~~was~~ was avoided by drawing from the Fountainhead. Moreover, the Reformed Churchmen believed that the Ministry was essential to the Church and must continue, and that the Church itself would continue, so there would result a continuous Ministry in a continuous Church. There a great effort would have to be to make as sure as possible that this continuous official Ministry should coincide with the "Series" of faithful preachers of the Word.

As for Validity in the Ministry, lawfulness was conferred by the due authorisation of the True Church, and efficaciousness belonged to a preaching Ministry in possession of the Divine Word, which gave to all the ^{works} ~~work~~ and ^{activities} ~~activity~~ of the Ministry their supreme value. A valid Ministry in these respects was what the Church by its very system had to strive to secure in appointing ministers.

This brings us lastly to the characteristic feature of the Reformed Church Doctrine of the Ministerial Order. The Ministry must be a preaching Ministry. preaching the Word of God, as we would add, in Christ. This was to be its essential character. If there was to be a Ministry at all, this must be the nature of the office. Its chief exercise was to be the preaching of the Word of God. The Reformed Churchmen could not find in the Scriptures, which they acknowledged emphatically as their

XIII. Summing Up.

guide, any authorisation for a sacrificing priesthood under the Christian dispensation, certainly not for a Ministry whose chief office was, by repeating what was almost like magical formulae, to produce a sacrifice for the living and the dead. But they could find in the Scriptures ample authorisation for a preaching Ministry. Those ringing words of the Old Testament would not be lost upon them- "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation; that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth." And they would know well the great Commission of the King and Head of the Church- "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." Their conception of the world was of a much narrower and smaller world than ours, and that narrowed their application of the great Commission. Yet they knew of it. It was, we can well believe, one of the leading regulative words of their Ministry. They knew, also, what kind of a Ministry the Apostles, and Evangelists, and other Church Officials, of the fresh first Christian century had chiefly fulfilled in the way of preaching and teaching. So that was how it came about, that their doctrine for the Ministry was this, that the True Ministry was and ever must be above all a preaching Ministry of the things of God in Christ.

In concluding, we cannot do better than make two quotations from the writings of one who has already been referred to in this thesis, who was a most worthy member in the succession of Reformed Ministers in Switzerland, Alexander Vinet. In a

XIII. Summing Up.

later part of his book, "Pastoral Theology", he says- "This is the glory of our Reformation, that it has restored public preaching to the Church, I may even say to the Catholic Church. Surely that was a noble movement by which the priesthood passed from a simple celebration of rites - which had become a species of magic - to science, to thought, to speech, to aggressive action."⁽¹⁾ And in an earlier part of the same book he ~~says~~ expresses himself in words which may most suitably conclude our subject- "Among us the ministry is especially a ministry of the word; with us so far from the Word becoming a ritual form, the ritual form becomes the Word; we take in its fullest acceptation, the idea of the Apostles, who traced back the work of the Gospel to the incarnation of the Word; and we do not find anything too strong in the words of Erasmus- "Diabolus concionator : Satanas per serpentem Loquens seduxit humanum genus : Deus, per Filium, Loquens, reduxit oves ~~erraticas~~ // 7 // (2) // erraticas". "(2).

(1) Vinet. "Pastoral Theology." p.173.

(2) Do. Do. p.18.

III. Ordinary Duties.

That keen and bitter controversy which was carried on in England during the reign of Elizabeth regarding the wearing of vestments had to do with the renunciation of the doctrines of a priestly office for the clergy. The strict Reformers thought that not even the priestly vestments should be worn by officiating ministers. It was not such an indifferent matter as some thought then and have thought since. There was danger with the use of the vestments that the idea of the priestly office would be brought back. And besides the wearing of such garments was unsuitable and misleading. They were looked on as "defiled with infinite superstition".(1) In reply to the English bishop, Horne, in a letter Bullinger gives his opinion on the matter in dispute-"I do not approve of the linen surplice, as they call it, in the ministry of the Gospel, in- as much as those robes copied from Judaism, savour of popery, and are introduced and established with injury to Christian liberty. If it had seemed a thing of so great importance to the Apostles, that the ministers should be distinguished from the general body of ~~the~~ Christians, why did they not retain the ephod according to the Lord's institution? I wish however that the habit in which the minister performs divine service, should be decent, according to the fashion of the country, and have nothing light or fantastic about it."(2). Very probably in England, but for Elizabeth, the priestly vestments would have been discarded. She insisted on the

(1) "Troubles at Frankfort". A Letter from Beza and Others. p.342. Cf. "Puritan Manifestoes." pp.35,36.